

699.e y
5

A
R E P L Y
TO THE
D E F E N C E
OF THE
L E T T E R
TO
Dr. W A T E R L A N D.

By the *Author* of the REPLY to the LETTER.

—quantò ille magis formas se vertit in omnes,
Tantò, nate, magis contende tenacia vincla.

Virg. Georg. IV. 411.

The SECOND EDITION. 200

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. W A T T S at the Printing-Office in
Wild-Court near Lincoln's-Inn Fields.

M D C C X X X I I .



S



which
much
I could
lish su
The
Letter,
hoods b
by whic
of Mos
fifteen
falsely
have an
tion t
cept o
But I
rashly
your L
do not



S I R,



T last, after the Space of near twelve Months, the *Defence* of your Letter to Dr. *Waterland* has appear'd in Print: But I make no Exceptions to the length of Time which you took, since I must own, that a much longer Time would have past before I could have prevail'd with my self to publish *such* a Defence.

The Reply, which I formerly made to your Letter, charged it with containing *many Falsehoods both in the Quotations and Historical Facts, by which you endeavoured to weaken the Authority of Moses.* To prove this Charge I produced fifteen Quotations and two Historical Facts as falsely reported by you: To each of these you have answered distinctly, denying the Accusation to be well grounded in any Instance, except one, to which you have pleaded Guilty. But I insist, Sir, upon it, that there is nothing rashly advanced against you in my Reply to your Letter; and if in the following Sheets I do not clearly shew, that, notwithstanding all

the Skill of your Defence, every single Instance of Falsehood charged upon you is made good; if I do not shew that the new Quotations which you have produced in the course of your *Defence*, are commonly of the same Stamp with the former; if I do not shew that you generally misrepresent the very Words of my *Reply*, and then form an Answer to what I never said or intended, I am content to pass for as low a Creature in Learning and Reasoning, as you (in Aid of your Arguments) have all along endeavoured to represent me.

Whether the Cause, which you alledge for your using me with such *Severity of Expression*, be a well-grounded one, I must leave to the Reader; all that I shall say upon the matter is, that you have mistaken my Meaning Here as elsewhere, and have acted in Retirement of only a fancied Injury: But I intend to make no Return, except of Reason and Argument; having seen too plain Proof in You that Men writing in the extreme Heat of Anger, like Men working in the extreme Heat of the Sun, spend themselves rather than dispatch Business.

What I had chiefly in view when I wrote my Reply, was the vindicating the *Authority of Moses*; and it is a Point of such Importance to Christianity that it will excuse my troubling the World with another Reply: It seemed to me to be attack'd in your Letter, and I have more Reason from reading your Defence to think that my Opinion was well grounded. In my first Reply I chiefly endeavoured to shew, that many of the Quotations and Facts which you had alledged for that purpose, were

so far from proving your Point, so far from being fairly argued from, that they were not so much as fairly represented. This was my Business then; but since your Defence goes further, and explains your Sentiments upon some Points of Importance more fully, I am willing to examine at large what you offer upon these two Questions, *Whether Moses's Account of the Creation and Fall of Man is to be understood literally or not; and Whether the Religion and Laws, which he delivered to the Jews, had a Divine Origin and Authority.* *This, Sir, will be the main Business of the following Sheets; but I think it necessary first to make good the Charge which I brought against you of false Quotations, and let the Reader be better acquainted with you, before he hears you further quoting and reasoning on those important Points of Inquiry.

The general Method, which you have taken in my Objections in your Defence, is very extraordinary: One while you represent me as translating the Passages in Dispute too verbally, whereas your Happiness is to *catch the true Sentiments of the Author.* And this Charge I am content to acknowledge very readily: The very Words, which you bring as a Proof of what you assert, I examine and shew to be no more: Is it any proper Answer after that to say, that you do not stand upon Grammatical Niceties, but express the Sense and Intent of the Author? Is not this, to change a fixed and visible Mark for a wide uncertain one, where the Reader's Eye may easily lose it self? At other times, when you are charged with false Quotations, you

you raise a mighty Outcry against *Prejudice* and *Systems*, against *stiff* and *dogmatical* *D*
views, and represent me as one that would
hinder all *free* Inquiries after Truth; a Com-
plaint which you have just as much Right
to make, as the Man, who is taken up for pass-
ing away counterfeit Money, has to complain
that such Usage tends to disturb the Freedom
of Trade and Commerce.

By way of Prelude to the Vindication of your
Quotations, (a) you make three slight Objec-
tions to as many Particulars in the Introduction
to my Reply. They are so slight, that I am
content to let the first and the third of them
pass without Answer, tho' you take Occasion
from thence to charge me with Insincerity.
To the second, which seems most material,
I would offer a few Words that the Reader may
see how you set out, and what a Defence
is likely to expect from you. I had said that
in your Letter you had *hardly made one Original*
Quotation of an Author in his true Sense,
to this you reply, that *out of about eighty Quo-*
tations I pretend to criticize but fifteen. Is
this, Sir, just in the Spirit of your Letter?
Is not this Misrepresentation again? Don't
plainly speak of *Original Quotations*,
don't you speak of Quotations in general?
There may be eighty of that Sort in your
Letter: I so little liked what I had examined
that I had no great Desire to look into more
of them. But the Truth is (as my Title Page
set forth) that I meant to dispute with you

(a) Def. Pag. 6, 7.

(a) Def. 1

quotations, but such as tended to *weaken the Authority of Moses*; and even of those, I concern'd my self with none but such as were *Original* ones: What you took at second hand from other Authors I never meant to charge you with: If they are false, I knew that those Authors were chiefly answerable for the Falsehood of them. Deduct from the Number of eighty such as are not *Original* Quotations, with such no ways affect the Authority of *Moses*, and I will undertake still to prove that in your Letter you have hardly made one *Original* Quotation of an Author in his true Sense.

But I come to the Particulars of my Charge, and your Defence of them.

I. II.

I had objected to you that in quoting two passages out of *Cicero de Nat. Deor. l. 3. c. 31, 38.* you had falsely urged them as containing *Cicero's* sentiment, since the Speaker there is *Cotta*, and *Cicero*, who was present at the Disputation concludes at breaking it up, that the Argument, which *Balbus* held against *Cotta*, seemed to him more probable of the two; and even *Cotta* himself, after all, confesses that what he had said was not his real Opinion but for Argument's sake, and that he certainly knew that *Balbus* could convince him. This was the Substance of my Objection to your two Quotations; and now, what is it that you say in your Defence? Why (a) do you tell us that *Cicero* being an *Academic* as well as *Cotta*, if there be any thing in that

(a) Def. Pag. 9.

whole Dialogue which can be called Cicero's own more peculiarly and properly than the rest, it is the very Part and Character assign'd to Cotta. But unde petitum hoc in me jadis? Is not this Weapon borrowed from the Author of the *Discourse of Free-thinking*, who formerly received such Instruction and Chastisement on this very Article from *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, that I never expected to meet any one for the future so venturesome as to assert that Cicero's true Sentiments are to be found under the Character of his Academic Speakers. You allow me to be but little acquainted with Cicero's Dialogues, choose therefore to refer you for farther Information in this Point to that learned Writer, Part II. p. 78. Cicero's true Sentiments are to be found in his *Offices*, in his *Tusculan Disputations* and other Pieces of his where he dogmatizes and delivers his Opinion of things; but not in his *Dialogues*, unless (as the Case before us) when, the Dispute being ended, he declares on one side of the Question. And since he has done this, will you pretend Sir, to argue from his being an *Academic*, that he must have held the very reverse of those Sentiments, in Favour of which he so openly pronounces?

What you add, looks as if it was drawn out of the same Quiver with the other; for you tell us that Cicero in his second Book de Divinatione where he disputes in his own Person, takes the same side and uses the same Arguments which I had put here into the Mouth of Cotta, to confute the Opinion of the Stoics about Religion and Divination. How are we to understand you here

(a) Def. Pag. 9.

Not surely as if it was *Cotta* in the third Book of the *Nature of the Gods*, that endeavour'd to controvert the Opinion of the Stoics about Religion and Divination, since *Cicero* himself giving a Reason for his writing the two Books of Divination, (a) says that he had omitted that Point in his three Books of the *Nature of the Gods*. You must mean therefore (as the turn of the Sentence seems to require) that *Cicero* in his second Book of *Divination* argues against Religion as well as Divination. This is implied in what you said before of his taking the same side and using the same Arguments here, which *Cotta* did there; for *Cotta* plainly disputed there against Religion, and you would insinuate that *Cicero* did so in this Book: But that this is directly false, will appear from *Cicero*'s own Words here: When he had been disputing against Divination or the Art of conjecturing about things future, to prevent all Mistakes about this matter (though it seems he could not do it) and to shew that he had not been disputing against Religion, he puts in his Caveat to this Effect in the last Chapter: (b) *I am very careful to have this understood aright, that to take away Superstition is not to take away Religion: a wise Man will be for preserving all the sacred Rites and Ceremonies established by our Ancestors; and the Frame of the Universe obliges us to own that there is an eternal Being of great Ex-*

(a) Quod pratermissum est in illis libris, credo, quia communis arbitratu es separatim id quari, deque eo differi, id de Divinatione, &c. de Divin. lib. 1. cap. 5.

(b) Nec verò (id enim diligenter intelligi volo) superstitione lata religio tollenda, &c.

cellency, &c. Wherefore as Religion, which has
close Union with the Knowledge of Nature, ought
to be propagated; so Superstition, &c. What
Misrepresentation if this be not?

The better to reconcile what you have
thereto said of *Cicero's* Sentiments with his ex-
press Declaration to the contrary; you have
in p. 10. changed *Cicero's* Words, the more
probable instead of somewhat the more probable
this sounds softer, and prepares the Reader
to admit of your farther Answer to my Ob-
jection, which is, that when *Cicero* pronounced
in favour of the *Stoics* Opinion, it may well
be look'd upon as a Compliment to *Brutus*, to whom
the Book is address'd, and who was himself
Stoic: In support of this fancied Compliment
you discover *Cicero* elsewhere, as allowing
the Philosophy which *Brutus* followed, to be
the best, *De Fin.* 1. 3. c. 2. Strange that you should
represent *Cicero* as complimenting with such
Insincerity! For if according to you, the other
side of the Question contained *Cicero's* real Sen-
timents, it must be something more than
a Compliment in him, to tell *Brutus* that
he thought the *Stoics* side was the more probable
of the two. The Truth of the Case is that
that an *Academic* in virtue of his Claim
never pronouncing any thing as Certain,
Probable only, confined himself within
Bounds, but hunted in the Fields of every
Philosophy: What he found among the *Peripatetics*
to his liking he took at his Pleasure
and the same Liberty he claim'd among the *Schools*
and others. *Cicero* particularly is observed
to have made many of the *Stoics* Notions
his own; in his Offices he follows them and

(4) Def. 1

his *Paradoxes*; and why might he not by
 the same Rule follow them in their Sentiments
 about the *Nature of the Gods*? Nay, why might
 he not call theirs the *best kind* of Philosophy?
 It was not inconsistent with his being an *Aca-*
ademic; for the *Academics* had no peculiar and
 distinguishing Notions about these things;
 their Badge was to pronounce nothing *certain*,
 and while they kept to that, they were at li-
 berty to prefer one Philosophy before another.
 Thus far you and I have debated about *Ci-*
cero's Opinion: But I had gone farther in my
 reply and produced *Cotta* himself declaring
 after all, that what he had said was for Ar-
 gument's sake only, and not even his real Opi-
 nion. This you call a betraying of my Igno-
 rance: How? Why, because *Cotta* was an *Aca-*
ademic, and (a) therefore, tho' agreeably to the
 principles of his *Seet*, he might wish to be con-
 sidered, i. e. to have some greater Degree of Pro-
 bability offered to him than what he had before
 acquiesced in; yet must he be suppos'd in the mean
 while to approve the Sentiments he had been as-
 serting, as the most probable. How the face
 of things may be changed! Tho' he might
 wish (say you) to be confuted; but *Cotta*
 says more than this in those Words of his,
facile me à te vinci posse, certò scio. You add
 that he must have approved the Sentiments he had
 been asserting, as the most probable; but how is this
 consistent with the Declaration of his knowing
 for a certain that *Balbus* could confute him?
 And how is it consistent with what you said

(a) Def. Pag. 10.

before concerning *Cicero*, that his true Sentiments are to be found in the Part assign'd to *Cotta*; for then (in your way of reasoning) *Cicero's* approving of *Balbus's* side in the Question as the *more probable*, and *Cotta's* approving of his own side as the *most probable*, are the same thing. Too great a Contradiction to be father'd upon so judicious a Writer as *Cicero*.

III.

Your Letter represented *Cicero* as saying that *it is the common Opinion of all Philosophers that the Deity can neither be angry nor hurt anybody*. To this I replied that *Cicero* puts these Words into the Mouth of an Objector, and that therefore they are falsely quoted for *Cicero's* Sentiments. This you cannot deny, and yet you care not to own. To make a Show of answering me, you ask (a) *Whether a Fact is less true for being proposed as an Objection?* The *Fact* may not be less true for that, but it is certainly less true that these Words contain *Cicero's* real Opinion: But you add, 'tis possible it seems, in *Cicero* as an Objection, and 'tis possible just so in my Letter. Can you be serious, Sir, in meaning that we should take this for a Defence of your Quotation? Was not the Design of your quoting this and other Passages from *Cicero*, expressly pronounced in your Letter p. 18. to be that we might know what were his Sentiments declared in some Cases, that from

(a) Def. Pag. 11. /

thence we might be inform'd what unprejudiced Reason would determine upon the literal History of Man's Fall? Have You forgot, or would you have us forget that you appeal to the Authority of Cicero? And would you now try to lay the same Weight upon the Authority, not of Cicero, but of an Objector whom he mentions, and afterwards replies to? The Passage stands indeed in your Letter as an Objection to Dr. W. but is not mentioned as an Objection in Cicero from whom you take it; and it is the Want of that which makes it a false Quotation, such as will ever be an Objection to your Letter.

There are some other slight Cavils, which you use against my Reply upon this Article; but I am content to leave them to the Reader, who (it is hoped) will compare my Words with your Representation of them.

IV.

I objected to a Passage which you had produced from *Cicero de Divin.* l. 2. c. 68. about a Serpent's appearing to *Alexander* in a Dream and speaking to him. You had said that *Cicero* laughed at the Story; and from thence you concluded that he would have laughed much more at the literal Story in Genesis, of a Serpent actually speaking and reasoning. To this I replied, that *Cicero* does not appear to have laughed at that Story of *Alexander's* Serpent; nay, he was so far from doing so, that he did not actually disbelieve the Story; he says, it may be true that *Alexander* dreamed so. Now you

you tell me (a) that what *Cicero* ridiculed, was not so much the Extravagance of a Dream, as the pretended miraculous Effect of it, and the foolish Credulity of those who look on such Dreams as sent from God. Is not this altering the Question? Is all this included in your saying that he laughed at the Story? Have you a word in your Letter about any Effects of the Dream? And is such an Addition consistent with your Application of this Story to that of *Moses*? By no means; but, it seems, this is one way of avoiding the Charge of a false Quotation. If this will not do, you insist upon it without that *Cicero* laughs too at the Fancy of a *Serpent's* speaking, &c. But I insist upon it in return that he does not, and I give this Reason for it, he says, *poteſt eſſe verum*, it may be true whereas you insist upon it without assigning a Reason, and come under the Description which *Cicero* gives of some in his Days, *Ugent ruſticè ſanè; negant enim poſſe, & inperſtant*. De Offic. l. 3. c. 9.

By the way permit me to give the Reader one Instance how happily you have changed my Words, in order to make me the Subject of some of your ingenious Railery. I have said that, notwithstanding what *Cicero* speaks in the Passage under Consideration, he might have believed the literal Story of *Moses's* *Serpent*. But here you shew your Dexterity at quoting again, and represent me, p. 12. as saying, that he must needs have believed it. Are these two Expressions the same? Let us try

(a) Def. Pag. 12.

upon your self: If instead of saying that you might have known this to be a false Citation, I should say that you *must needs* have known it to be so; would not you look upon me, Sir, as doing you a great piece of Injustice?

V.

The next Quotation which I examin'd was what you drew from *Josephus* against *Apion*, 2. c. 13. where to strengthen your Suspicion that *Circumcision* was derived to the *Jews* from the *Egyptians*, you represent him as saying, that the *Egyptians* are all *Circumcised*; in Answer to this I shew'd from the express Words of that Passage, that only the *Priests of Egypt* are there said to be ALL of them *circumcised*. What is it that you do on this Occasion? Why, you grew warm, and with many angry Reproaches you represent me as a Pretender to Learning, as a Dealer in Scraps and marginal Citations, as fighting in the Dark, beating the Air, bruising my Knuckles against Posts, and you threaten to shew all this before you have done with me. But it is certainly no good Sign, when a Writer flies out into a Passion, especially so early in the Controversy. Your Behaviour puts me in mind of a Story which Mr. Locke us'd to tell. A Friend of his at *Utrecht* having been present at a Thesis publicly maintain'd there in *Latin*, and telling Mr. Locke where he had been that Morning, Mr. Locke ask'd him, what He could learn there, when he did not understand one Word of *Latin*; Enough (says the Gentleman) to know how Matters went; and I plainly saw that the Professor

Profession had the worst of it, because he began very soon to be angry.

But to our purpose; what is it that you reply to the Charge of falsely quoting? Do you deny it? No: Do you own it? No: All that you say on this head is, that *Josephus* may be understood of a peculiar Obligation or absolute Necessity, which the Priests were under to be circumcised above all other Men. p. 22. but before he may be understood thus, some material Words must be added to the Sentence, which are now wanting; and this would in effect again amount to a false Quotation.

The Substance of your Defence on this Article, is to draw your Reader off from the Charge brought against you, by endeavouring to make out three things, *That the Egyptian People in general were circumcised; That Josephus understood Herodotus in that very Sense; and that Circumcision was used for the sake of outward Cleanliness.* Now suppose you could prove these three Points clearly, would the Charge of falsely quoting *Josephus's* Words be thereby avoided? Not in the least: By dropping the proper Question, you chose rather to dazzle your Readers with a Shew of Learning.

As to the first of these Points, whether the *Egyptians* in general were circumcised, it is no very material Inquiry; I shall leave it therefore in your hands or rather in *Calmet's*, from whom you borrow'd what you offer in the Affirmative, and from whom you might have borrow'd more for the Negative side of the Question.

Nor is the third Point of much Importance, whether the *Egyptians* circumcised for *Cleanliness*, as you interpret *Herodotus's* Word, or for *Purity* as I thought it signified: Yet so much may be said on this Occasion, that what you call a *Blunder* of mine, is what you fall into your self, even while you are reproaching me with it; for you suppose *Circumcision* among the *Egyptians* to have been considered as a religious Test, p. 22; which Supposition (if not the very same with mine, yet) comes much nearer to my Notion of *Purity* than to Yours of *Cleanliness* being intended by it. But it is of some Importance to me, that you represent me, p. 24. as saying that *Circumcision* was given the *Jews* for the sake of *Purity*; when I only intimated that they thought it a Mark and Emblem of *Purity*, reckoning all uncircumcised men to be impure and unclean, p. 16. This Notion the *Jews* certainly had, and it was not inconsistent with their receiving *Circumcision* as a Sign and Seal of a Covenant between God and his People; just as Baptism among Christians is a Sign and Seal of a new Covenant, and it is at the same time an Emblem of the *Purity*, which those ought to have, who enter into that Covenant. What Occasion was there then to charge me on this head, as being little acquainted with *Scriptural* and *Jewish* History? Why was your Reader called upon to make a proper Reflection, and invited to take a cure of your Prejudice, that your Defence might be Read with the same Spirit with which it was Written?

But to the second of those Points I have nothing more material to object. Your Assertion

sertion is this; *Josephus understood Herodotus to mean that the Egyptians in general were circumcised.* But all that *Josephus* in this Passage ascribes to *Herodotus*, is the saying that the *Egyptians taught other People the use of Circumcision.* And how does this prove that the *Egyptians* in general were circumcised? Is not the Sentence equally true, if their Priests only were circumcised? How then can this shew, that *Josephus* understood the Words in your Sense of them? *Josephus* quotes *Herodotus*, only upon the Article of the *Egyptians having taught other People to be circumcised*; not for a Testimony of His, that he wanted about the *Egyptians* using *Circumcision*: That Point he knew as well as his Author, having been in *Egypt* himself; and having seen what was practised there. And that the *Egyptians* in general were not circumcised, may be strongly inferr'd from the very next Passage to this from whence you draw the contrary Opinion and impute it to *Josephus*; for there when he is giving an Account of the Death of *Apion* who was (b) a true and original *Egyptian*, says that at last (c) he was forced to be circumcised upon account of a Distemper which he had and of which he died: So that *Apion* was not circumcised before, nor would have been so had not Necessity had not compelled him. This may suffice to shew both that the *Egyptians* in general did not practise this Rite, and that *Josephus* knew very well they did not. If

(a) *Contra Apion*. l. 1. c. 9.

(b) *Ib.* l. 2. c. 3.

(c) *Ib.* l. 2. c. 3. *ἀεὶ τελευτῶν δὲ καὶ ἀνέστης, &c.*

only add, that *Josephus* represents Circumci-
 sion as given to *Abraham*, that his *Posterity*
 might not be mix'd with other Nations. *Antiqu.*
 1. c. 10.

We may see that you have as ill Luck as
 ever at Quotations by what you have added
 on this Occasion, p. 22. *Where Josephus* (say
 you) *appeals to Herodotus for affirming the E-*
gyptians to be Authors of Circumcision to all
other People and even to the Jews, he makes no
other Reflexion upon it, than that, of such things
every one may say what he thinks fit.

This, Sir, I shall shew to be a most false
 representation of the Matter: You refer to *Jo-*
sephus's Antiq. 1. 8. c. 10. Sect. 3. where the Case
 is this. That Historian having given an Ac-
 count of *Shishac's* over-running *Judea* in *Re-*
boam's Reign, and plundering the City and
 Temple of *Jerusalem*, says that *Herodotus* men-
 tions this Event in his History; for he speaks
 (says he) of an *Egyptian* King as having sub-
 dued *Syria Palestina*. And to shew that *Herodo-*
tus meant *Judea* by that Name, *Josephus* quotes
 another Passage of the same Author, where
 he says that the *Syrians in Palestine* confess they
 learned Circumcision from the *Egyptians*:
 This proves the Point (says *Josephus*) because
 other *Syrians in Palestine* are circumcised
 like the *Jews*: And then he adds, but of such
 things every one may say, what he thinks fit: i. e.
 about the Question, Whether the *Jews*
 learned Circumcision from the *Egyptians*; but
 not this Question, Whether that Passage in
Herodotus confirmed the Scriptural Account of
Shishac's over-running *Judea* and plundering
 the City and Temple of *Jerusalem*. Here then

is another Instance of gross Misrepresentation even while you are endeavouring to clear yourself from the Charge of it: How hard it to get rid of a bad Habit!

VI.

The next Point in Dispute between us w the Sense of *Josephus* in that Passage again *Apion*, where he is speaking of *Moses* and other ancient Lawgivers: But this, by theference which you have drawn from it, being made a Point of very great Importance shall refer what I have to say on that Article to the latter end of this Reply, where it will meet with a distinct and full Examination.

VII.

To prove that many Customs and Constitutions the Jewish Law were evidently deriv'd from Egyptian Source, you bring (p. 46.) a Passage from *Herodotus* to this purpose, that the Egyptians are governed by Laws and Customs peculiar to themselves, and different from those of other Nations. Here I reminded you that *Herodotus* says (a) from those of ALL other Nations. I saw that this Quotation of yours was brought to shew how in Fact many Customs of the Jewish Law were borrowed from the Egyptians, therefore I argued that the Word ALL, which you left out, was a material Word, because it inferr'd that the Jews had no Customs or Laws resembling Theirs. But now you inform me, that you only meant to draw this inference, That as the Egyptians affected a P

(a) l. 2. c. 91.

liarity in their Laws, so did the Jews in Theirs;
 and this Humour you suppose was derived
 from *Egypt*: Whatever you meant, it is plain
 that your Point was to prove *many Customs and*
Constitutions of the Jewish Law, not the Turn
or Genius only of the whole Law, to have
 been borrowed from the *Egyptians*. But
 you say farther, that your *Argument previously*
supposes some Resemblance of Customs between the
Jews and Egyptians grounded on the long Resi-
dence of the Jews in Egypt, p. 47. and when
 you are got a few Pages farther, you say, p. 53.
 that it is *endless to run through all the Jewish*
Customs which learned Men have deduced from
Egypt; among which you reckon the Taber-
nacle, Ark, Cherubims, Altar, Sacrifices, Sab-
batb, &c. Pray, Sir, how is this to be re-
 conciled with that Inference of yours before
 mentioned? If both those Nations affected a
Peculiarity in their Laws from ALL other Na-
tions, how came there to be some Resemblance,
 say a perfect Uniformity of Customs among
 them? Or if there was that *Resemblance and*
Uniformity of Customs borrowed by the Jews
from the Egyptians, how can the Jews be
 charged with affecting a *Peculiarity in their*
Laws from ALL other Nations? The two
 Pleas will not tally; one of them must be false,
 and I leave it with you which of the two you
 shall please to renounce. This, after all, is
 certain, that if (as *Herodotus* says) *the Egyp-*
tan Laws and Customs were different from those
of ALL other Nations, the Jews could have no
Customs resembling Theirs, which yet your
 Letter immediately after attempts to shew in
 six or seven Instances.

One .

VIII.

One of these Instances is this; In p. 48. you quote *Herodotus* as saying that *the Egyptians were more addicted to Prodiges and Miracles than any other People*. I objected to this Quotation because the Words *and Miracles* are not in the Original, and because *τεράλα* there cannot signify *Miracles*; but *Prodiges* only (such as monstrous Births, unnatural Copulations, &c. as the next Words of *Herodotus* shew, (a) for (says he) *when a Prodigy happens, they observe and write down the Event; and, if afterwards any thing happens like that Prodigy, they conclude that the Event will be the same*. To this you reply that *τεράλα* does, sometimes mean *Miracles*. I grant it: but it cannot possibly do so here, and you yourself do not directly say it does. Only you hint as if the Sentence which you quoted, was compleat in its self, because in all our Editions it is distinguished by a full Stop. But if that is Fact, any one must see that they are all wrong, because the next Words for *when a Prodigy happens, &c.* are plainly a Reason given for what preceded them. And the same Word *τεράλα* being used in the last part of the Sentence, its undoubted Meaning there must determine its Meaning in the former part.

But you make a second little Effort to shew that *τεράλα* may signify *Miracles* here; by giving a new Sense to *ἀνεύρη* which you explain by *contrived, invented, or found out*: Ju

(a) l. 2. c. 82.

now your Editions were good Authority, and here, it seems, they are none, for you have found a Sense of this Word contrary to Theirs: But that is not the worst of it: it is contrary to the best of *Herodotus's* Meaning; he says, *γυμνὰς ὅτε* for when a Prodigy happen'd: Can that be said to happen, which is the Effect of Contrivance? And what could induce the *Egyptians* to observe and write down the Event of a Miracle which was only *invented* and *contrived*? It would have been well, if you had allowed fewer Miracles to the *Egyptians* and more to *Moses*.

IX.

In your next Quotation from *Herodotus*, your Matter represents him as saying that the *Egyptians* had one High Priest as well as an Hereditary Priesthood descending from Father to Son: Which you offer as one Instance of a Jewish Custom derived from the Egyptian Source. I objected to this Quotation as giving a false Account of the Matter. The Words of *Herodotus* are these, (a) *Every God has several Priests, of which (several Priests of every God) is one High Priest*; which plainly imply that there must have been more High Priests in Egypt than One, as there were more Gods worshipped there than one; they were thirty perhaps in number, as the *Nomes* and Gods worshipped in those *Nomes* were: What says your Defence to this? Why, first you twice change the Expression *one High Priest* into an *High Priest*, as if you meant to make the Reader think that the Question here between us

(a) l. 2. c. 37.

was, Whether the *Egyptians* had an *High Priest* (whereas I affirmed that they had several;) nor Whether they had One over the whole Nation which was what your Quotation implied, and which I shew'd to be contrary to the Meaning of *Herodotus*.

Next you pretend that your Endeavour was only to prove a *Similitude of Custom*, not *Identity or absolute Uniformity in all Points and Circumstances*: But whatever you endeavour to prove, you quoted *Herodotus* for a different Meaning from his true one: And if you had quoted him right, the Reader might have seen that it was not so likely for the Custom, of having one national High Priest, to have been borrowed by the *Jews* (if borrowed at all) from the *Egyptians*, as from other Nations where we know for a certain that there was such an Establishment, though perhaps not in *Egypt*. This, Sir, is the Meaning of what I said in p. 25. and shall leave it to the Reader to judge whether the Assertion was so silly an one, as to merit the *Laughter of every Man of Sense*. p.

In the last Place you attempt to shew that your Sense of *Herodotus* is very clear from other Passages of his History; you refer to some of them: But if you can prove the Point from other Passages, the Reader will remember that it cannot be proved from that which I objected to as proving the very contrary. This by the by; Let us now see what your Proof of yours will produce. You allude to *Herod. l. 2: c. 143.* that each High Priest provided a Statue for himself; and that the Priest shew'd *Herodotus*, in a large Room or Temple 341 (it should be 345) Statues, the Images

many *High Priests* in lineal Descent from
 father to Son; and that the Number of their
High Priests and Kings happened to be Equal.
 This you make decisive for there being one High
 Priest over all *Egypt*: But when the Passage is
 more considered, it is plain that nothing can
 be certainly concluded from it: For every God
 had his several *Priests* in *Egypt*, one of which was
 the High Priest (as *Herodotus* had before said): now
 these were the *Priests* of *Jupiter* at *Thebes*, which
 would *Herodotus* these Statues of the High
 Priests in the Temple of that God, and there-
 fore it is most likely that the High Priests,
 represented by those Statues, were not High
 Priests over all *Egypt*, but such as presided
 over those Priests only which belong'd to the
 Temple of *Jupiter*. The former Passage being
 more and express, this latter one should in
 reason be understood consistently with That.

X.

to the Charge of false Quotation under this Ar-
 gument, you plead, p. 54. Guilty of the Fact, but not
 of the Intention; however, since I have taken from
 an *Egyptian Custom*, you think your self obliged
 to replace it with another, viz. the Laws about
 Animals clean and unclean: which (as you say)
 learned *Cotelerius* allows to have been taken pro-
 perly from the Practice of *Egypt*. But you might
 say, Sir, that others, as learned Men, have
 shown that this Distinction of Clean and Un-
 clean Animals (which implies Laws about them)
 is previous to the Flood, and that there is no
 need to send the Jews to *Egypt* for the bor-
 rowing this Custom. You may see this Mat-
 ter more at large in Mr. *Shucford's* Connect. &c.

vol. 1. p. 81. and vol. 2. p. 409. and in
Univ. Hist. b. 1. c. 7.

XI.

We come to the last of the Quotation which you made from *Herodotus*, to prove in Fact many *Jewish* Customs were derived from the *Egyptians*: you represent him as saying that the *Egyptians* *abhorred Swines Flesh* *impure and abominable*. This I allow'd to be so far true, that he says the *Egyptians* *esteemed Hog to be an impure Beast*; Is this the same (tho' p. 51. you call it the same) with allowing you *delivered the true Sense of Herodotus*? Is it not necessary, that they who reckoned an *Hog* *impure Beast*, should therefore abominate the *Flesh* of it, which it is plain the *Egyptians* did not? for *Herodotus* adds (and you, to have made your Quotation a fair one, should have added) that the *Egyptians* *had Swineherds among them, sacrificed Swine, and even eat of the Flesh of them*. These three Circumstances you dropped, I objected that this was *Partiality* in quotation. This you call my *usual Acuteness*, and represent yourself as not bound to *shew in all Particulars an Identity of Custom*. But have you produced this *Identity of Custom* in any one Point? Can the *Egyptians* be said to have *abhorred Swines Flesh*, when they *eat* it at their most Religious Feasts? Did the *Jews* do any thing like this at either their Publick or Private Meetings? Where is the Resemblance then? And how could the *Egyptian* Notion of the Impurity of Swine be the same with that of the *Jews*?

All this while, Sir, you have taken no notice of that remarkable Passage which

quod

quoted from Mr. Shucford's Connect. Vol. I. 317. in these Words, *There is one Observation, which as far as I have had Opportunity to apply it, will fully answer every Particular that Mr. Spencer has offer'd, and that is this; He is able to produce no one Ceremony or Usage practised in the Religion of Abraham or Moses, and that of the Heathen Nations, but that it may be proved that it was used by Abraham or Moses, or by some of the true Worshippers of God earlier than by any of the Heathen Nations.* As to the regard you have paid to a Passage which is cited from Josephus, and which is very decisive against your suppos'd Resemblance of the Jewish and Egyptian Religious Customs; in Words I will give you once more. He acknowledges this as one Reason why the Egyptians hated the Jews so much, viz. the great Difference in the Religions of the two (a) Nations; the Jewish Worship being as different from that establish'd among the Egyptians, as the Nature of God is from that of the Brutes. To which Testimony may be added another of the same Author, who says that (b) the Jewish Laws differed from the Grecian, but more especially from those of the Egyptians.

XII.

I charged you under this Article with falsely translating a Passage of Spencer, where he speaks (as you say) in the Words of *Maimonides*. To shew that Circumcision was so

(a) *Contra Apion*. l. 1. c. 29.(b) *Ib.* l. 1. c. 7.

hazardous a thing that it often proved more so. you quote these Words from Spencer, *res durissima & difficillima, nec sine vite discrimine quandoque subeunda*, and render them thus, most harsh and dangerous thing, not to be undergone without some Hazard of Life; as if it was hazardous in general, whereas Spencer's Words only say that it was sometimes so. To which you reply, p. 76. that the preceding Words of Maimonides, *durissima & difficillima*, describe it as a most harsh and hazardous thing; most hazardous being the same as most dangerous. The Business is done, you have caught hold of the true Sentiment of the Author, and I am prov'd a solemn Pedant for following the Perplexities of the Original.

But there are some things, Sir, to be considered, before your Reply will be allow'd to be so satisfactory. Does *difficillima* necessarily signify hazardous or dangerous? But (what is more) at this time of day you might be known from a Pamphlet, intitled, *An Answer to your Letter on the Point of Circumcision*, that Spencer (or rather Buxtorf, whom he allow'd) has quite mistaken the Sense of Maimonides in this Passage. The Words *nec sine vite*, &c. are not to be found either in Maimonides or Buxtorf's Version; they are a Comment which Spencer (mistaking the Sense of the Word) drew from *difficillima*, and distinguish'd as Spencer's and not the Rabbi's in that very Edition, which you refer to, and you have represented it quite otherwise. I differ not much from the abovementioned Gentleman, and therefore offer the following Translation of the Words of Maimonides,

exactly agreeable to his Meaning. As for Circumcision, no one will (or would) perform it on himself or his Sons except for the sake of Religious Faith (or Obedience): Let it not be (accounted) as a Scratch of the Leg or a Burn of the Arm; but as a thing that will (or would) be very grievous, that the abundance of Love may be therefore manifested, i.e. as it gives Pain in the Operation, would justly be reckoned a hard or grievous thing, if those who underwent the Operation, did not thereby manifest their Love of God and shew their Readiness to obey his Institution. What is there now in this Passage, that represents Circumcision as a hazardous and dangerous thing? You have misrepresented Maimonides, and he has grossly mistaken Maimonides: In one thing you both agree, and that is to mislead the Reader: But for your farther Conviction on this Article, you would do well to reflect on another Passage, which the Answerer has produced from the same Maimonides: (a) It is permitted (says he) to circumcise with any thing, be it with a Flint or with any thing that cuts, because there is no danger. After this let Maimonides never be produced for the Voucher of its being a dangerous Operation.

XII.

You quoted Lightfoot in your Letter as informing us, that the frequent Mortality, which Circumcision occasioned, produced a standing Law,

(a) Maim. de Circumcis. c. 1.

that

that when any Person had lost three Children successively by the Operation, he was excused from circumcising the rest. To this I reply'd that Lightfoot says nothing there either of a standing Law, or of a frequent Mortality; by a standing Law, you tell me (with some Reflexions on my Understanding) that you did not mean Law of Moses: and I never understood you meaning so; no Words of mine imply it the least. You meant (you say, p. 57.) a Custom founded upon a Decree of the proper Judges of the Case, a Judgment of the Jewish Doctors, a Decision of them, which I expressed it to be. But I spoke of (what is the Truth of the Case) such a Decision as was not a publick but a private one; some deciding one way, and some the contrary way, for I think that the Numbers are pretty near equal on the two sides of the Question.

To prove, what I denied, that Lightfoot speaks of a frequent Mortality happening by Circumcision, you ask, p. 58: *Whether the Fact which Lightfoot mentions as sometimes happening, three Children dying of it successively, does not necessarily imply it.* But with your leave, Lightfoot no where mentions, this Event sometimes happening. He mentions such a Case indeed; and in the Place which he refers to as his Authority, there is only one Instance given of this Fact, of three Childrens dying successively, which you say happened sometimes. And yet (what is remarkable) in this very Instance, it appears that the three Children could not properly be said to die of the Circumcision, and that the fourth was not excused

that Account from being circumcised, but
 after tarrying a little while was circumcised, and
 did well after it. Both these Circumstances are
 directly contrary to what you had made *Light-*
foot say; and yet both of them have been
 shewn to be True from the Words of the
 original Authors, cited at large and explain'd
 by the Gentleman, p. 16. who wrote the *An-*
swer to your Letter on the Point of Circumcision.
 After this I need not be at much Trouble
 to shew, how unfairly you deal with me, when
 you represent me, p. 58. as allowing that there are
 in Record five or six Instances of three Children
 dying successively by Circumcision; which you
 think sufficient to shew that Circumcision was
 mortal. From whence you can gather
 the supposed Allowance of mine, I am at a
 loss to conceive: My Words are, *Lightfoot*
 cites five or six Passages indeed, in which men-
 tion is made of an uncircumcised Israelite and un-
 circumcised Priest, when their Brethren died of
 Circumcision. But are five or six Passages the
 same with five or six Instances? May they
 all relate to one Instance? Nothing ap-
 pears to the contrary in *Lightfoot*: He is able
 to produce but one Instance, which is that re-
 lated by *R. Nathan*, and which (as I said
 before) directly contradicts you in the two
 circumstances, for which you chiefly appeal
 to it. Most certainly you can never infer
 from *Lightfoot* and his Citations, that any one
 of those Authors must have known five or six
 Instances; which unless you suppose them to
 have done, your Application of the Case of
 the Small-pox to this purpose is very far from
 maintaining any Parallel to the Case in Question.

XIV.

We come now, Sir, in the course of your Misrepresentations to examine what you have said in your Letter about the Story of Babel. You seem displeased, p. 59. with my reckoning this in the Number of your *Quotations*. And it will be any Satisfaction to you, I am content to change the Name of it, because I don't love to dispute about Trifles, and because at this time perhaps you may have some difficulty to the Word *Quotations*. But thus much I hope to shew, that the Scripture has said one thing and you quite another; which if it be not the same as quoting falsely, is certainly the same as representing (not merely reasoning) falsely.

You had said in your Letter that it is evident from Gen. xi. *that the Sons of Noah were so far from any Resolution of not dispersing themselves, that they had already begun to disperse, had actually sent off a Colony from the East to the Land of Shinar*: And in Proof of your Assertion you quoted Passages from Patrick and Calmet. To this I reply'd, that the Scripture is as express against what is to You so evident as Words can represent it; and that the Question is what the Scripture teaches about the Matter, not what any Commentator has fancied. Here you attempt, p. 61. to play Doctor and me against each other; and because the Doctor had charged his Adversary with having no Acquaintance with the Commentators, I charge me with centemning you for being acquainted with the Commentators: But this Contradiction, if it may pass for Wit, cannot pass for Truth, because I only express a dislike of your trust

their Opinion against the plain Account
 in Scripture. It seems however that
 you thought your self safe under the Shelter of such
 Authority, p. 60. Was it this Thought, Sir, that
 you to represent the Sentiments of Calmet
 this head so very untruly, as you have done?
 Calmet in the Passage, which you produce
 in him, speaks of no Resolution of *dispersing*
themselves, till about a hundred Years after the
Flood; by which he means, till after they had
 journey'd from the East and were come to the
 River: That this is his Opinion, appears from
 Note on Gen. xi. 2. where he expressly says,
the first Men after the Deluge came by dif-
ferent Marches to the Land of Shinar, and were
gathered together in that Place. Calmet's Autho-
 rity therefore will serve you for no Shelter:
 it will not make you Safe, much less Orthodox
 (as you say), since his Opinion and yours are
 directly contrary. Bishop Patrick indeed fa-
 vours your Opinion; but the Scriptural Ac-
 count is directly opposite to what He and You
 have suggested.

In my Reply I quoted these Passages from
 Gen. xi. *The whole Earth was of one Speech, ver. 1.*
And it came to pass as they journey'd from the East,
they found a Plain in the Land of Shinar
and dwelt there, ver. 2. Upon which I observed,
 THEY who journey'd from the East to Shi-
 nar, and they who dwelt there, are here repre-
 sented as being the whole Earth. Your Defence
 endeavours to invalidate or rather puzzle this
 Proof, by intimating, p. 61. that in the last Verse
 of the preceding Chapter it is said of the Sons
 of Noah, *by them were the Nations divided in*
the Earth after the Flood: As if, because men-

E

tion

tion is there previously made of a Division the Division too must be previous in the order of Time to the Story of *Babel*. What more natural than that the sacred Historian should first mention a Division into Nations and then tell us (as he does in chap. xi.) how it came about? That this was the Case, Bishop Patrick (who is one of your *Shelters*) teaches you in his Note on chap. xi. 1. But he is no Authority with You I perceive, except when he speaks your Sentiments.

All this while, Sir, you forget or conceal the Passages of Scripture, upon which I have grounded my Assertion, that they had not begun to disperse before the Confusion of Languages happened at *Babel*: In ver. 9. it is *The Lord did there confound the Language of the Earth, and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the Earth.* it is possible for Words to represent in a plain Manner, that what happened there, happened not to a Part but to the whole of Mankind. And can any thing be more directly contrary to your Position? The Scripture says that *Babel* God confounded the Language of the Earth: you say that *all the Earth*, Mankind was *not there*. The Scripture says that from *Babel* God scattered them abroad upon the face of all the Earth: and you say there was some kind of Dispersion and people of different Countries previous to that Confusion. p. 61. From whence the Reader may see the Scripture plainly asserts one thing, you take upon you to assert another.

XV.

I am come now to the last of the Fifteen articles, upon which I charged you with misrepresenting the Authors that you refer to. In your Letter you had said, *All that we can collect from the Story of the building the Tower of Babel is that the Multitude, knowing they must disperse, had a mind before such Dispersion to erect some publick Monument of their Common Origin by building a City and Tower that should reach as high as Heaven: and that it was the Presumption and Arrogance of this Design, which induced God to baffle it by confounding their Language, and to disperse them from that Place, &c.* This I shew'd to be a collecting from the Scripture a Design quite different from what expressly mentions. The Words are (chap. xi. v. 4.) *Let us build us a City and a Tower, whose top may reach unto Heaven, and let us make us a Name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole Earth.* Where the Design of what they were doing is plainly declared to be that they might not be scattered abroad; but the Design which you ascribe to them is that they might have some publick Monument of their Common Origin. Can Designs be more different than these two are? Happy must the Art be that can reconcile Your Account with the Scriptural one! Let us see how you attempt to do it. You ask, p. 64. if the Scripture does not plainly intimate that the ground of their offending God was in the Design that they had proposed of building a Tower as high as Heaven; and whether it gives any other Instance of their Arrogance and Presumption. The Text, Sir, says

nothing of any *Arrogance and Presumption* the Builders, nor of any offending God, unless in the Sense of God's disapproving what they had projected, which he might do, and yet they might not have been guilty of what you lay to their charge. If they designed their building to prevent their being dispersed, and if it was God's Intention that such Dispersion should not be prevented, here was ground sufficient for God to act in such a manner, which should necessarily produce an early Dispersion. Again, in those Words of yours above mentioned you tell us as from Scripture that their Design *was to build a Tower as high as Heaven*, and soon after that *their Intent was to raise themselves a Name by the Project they had formed*. True; but is this all that the Scripture says? Is this the ultimate and proper End mentioned in the Text? They who said, *Let us build a Tower, and make us a Name*, intended (no doubt) to build a Tower and make themselves a Name: But this was in order to some other End, and that is plainly expressed in the Words *lest we be scattered abroad*. How, could you possibly hope that this would serve for an Answer with any attentive Reader?

The Dispute between You and Me is, whether the main Intent of the Builders was to erect a publick Monument *lest they should be scattered abroad*, as the Text says; or for a Memorial of their *Common Origin*, which is your Supposition, not only unwarranted, but directly contradicted by Scripture. You are pleased, p. 65. to call it *strange Nonsense* to say *Let us build us a City and a Tower to prevent farther Dispersion, &c.* but where does

Cha

Charge fall? Does it not fall upon the Scrip-
 ture, which adds *lest we be scattered abroad, &c.*?
 Can any thing be more clear than that the
 Text speaks the very thing which you distin-
 guish by the Title of *strange Nonsense*? But
 you add in support of what you had rashly
 said, as if a Tower could alter the Nature of
 things and prevent their being scattered and dis-
 persed to people the Earth, unless we can suppose
 them resolved to combat Heaven it self. What
 was there, Sir, for this Excursion to
 charge me with such a preposterous way of
 thinking, when you must have observed that
 my Account of the Matter fully obviated this
 Objection? I declared for the Opinion of Peri-
 cles and others, who by the Hebrew Word
Ma'amar, which we commonly render a Name,
 understand a Monument or Sign; and suppose
 that the Tower which those Builders projected
 was design'd for a Landmark, which by its
 height might be seen at a Distance; and by
 the help of which, whenever they were sepa-
 rated as their occasions required, they might
 always know how to return to the City, where
 they and their Companions seem to have de-
 termined to live together.

But whatever their Intent was, it could
 never have been what you venture in defiance of
 Scripture to ascribe to them; it could never
 have been for the having a publick Monument of
 their Common Origin: If that had been their
 view, they would probably have entered into
 such a Project before any of them had travelled
 eastward, and separated themselves (as you
 suppose they did) from the common Body of
 Mankind. Besides, it could scarcely have en-
 tered

tered Then into their Heads to conceive, that any succeeding Age would ever doubt of their having had a *Common Origin*; much less is it probable that they should have taken such Pains to prevent what was so unlikely to happen. And lastly, if this was all their Intent, how can you reconcile it with the *Arrogance and Presumption* which you suppose them to have been guilty of in this Attempt? Such a Design was most certainly a laudable one, worthy of use to Religion and Civil Life; and God could never have been so offended at it, as to confound their Language and disperse Men who had so innocent an Intent as this. The Objections I made to your awkward Supposition; but you have thought them not worthy the least mention: A strong Presumption that they are not to be answered by You, who never miss an Opportunity, but often make one, setting an Adversary forth to the utmost disadvantage! This will appear from what follows.

I had mentioned the old Greek and Latin Versions of this Text now before us, as regarding the latter Part of it, *before we be scattered, &c.* instead of *lest we be scattered, &c.* This Translation of theirs I happened to see an *Idle one*; with what Pleasure do you presently catch it up! How ready are you to make the most of it and to charge me *with rashly asserting the old Greek Version and calling it an idle Translation!* p. 65. But is this the Truth of the Matter? Do I charge the whole Version with Idleness? Is it not plain that I was speaking of that single Passage only? Read my Words again, and you must find it so. But what

Excuse to a
preffing
of the
as it
and h
very r
quote
at all
it so
Learn
your
than
throug
I ha
ance, v
ations
such a
which
presen
ate yo
to the
and the
reckoni
asure,
former I
but I co
objecte
number
tion to
article.
(1.) T
ree oth
so Po
Moses
ate, as
Exc

Excuse will you make for your self, Sir, when
 to aggravate my suppos'd Rashness of Ex-
 pression, you tell me that the *Greek Version*
 of the *LXX* Interpreters was *authenticated*
as it were by our *Saviour*? Where, when,
 and how? Pray inform us of this new Disco-
 very more particularly: Did our *Saviour* ever
 quote this Version? Did he ever speak *Greek*
 at all? If you have any Proofs of this Point,
 be so good as to communicate them to the
 Learned World; and they will tend more to
 your Credit as a Scholar (I can assure you)
 than any thing which you have offered
 throughout your whole Defence.

I have now finished my Reply to the De-
 fence, which you make upon the Fifteen Quo-
 tations (few in proportion to what deserved
 such a Censure, but yet the only Fifteen)
 which I objected to as gross and plain Mis-
 representations. You proceed next to vindi-
 cate your Historical Facts: These you reduce
 to the Number of Two, and then of One,
 and then of None, by a happy Sagacity of
 reckoning as well as Reasoning. Had I
 before, I could make ample amends for my
 former Deficiency in Number on this head:
 but I compute those Historical Facts, which
 I objected to in my first Reply, to be Five in
 Number, tho' the Four first having some Re-
 lation to each other I ranged them under one
 article.

(1.) The first Historical Fact including the
 three others annexed to it, was whether *Egypt*
 was so *Polite and Learned and Flourishing a Nation*
 as *Moses's time*, and the *Jews so rude and illi-*
berate, as you have represented them. The
 Substance

Substance of what I offer'd on this head, was that tho' your Opinion in favour of the Antiquity of the *Egyptian* Learning had long prevailed in the World, yet now that Sir *Isaac Newton's* Chronology had appear'd and given so different an Account of that Matter with such Appearance of Probability against the common Sentiment, it was not fair and equitable in you to put off the old Principles in Chronology, as undoubted Truths, and if nothing had been said by that Great Author to confute or weaken them.

It seems that in one place I had called what Sir *Isaac* has offered on that Point his *Dissertations*, and in another his *Demonstrations*. That you represent at every turn as an *Absurdity*, and tell me that *had I reflected what a Demonstration meant, I could never have applied it to a System of Chronology*, p. 69. But why not, Sir? because there are mathematical *Demonstrations*; does it follow that there is no other sort of *Demonstrations*? Convince your Readers first that *Eusebius's* Work called, *Demonstratio Evangelica*, carries Nonsense in the very Title. Convince them first that Bishop *Patrick* knew nothing of what a *Demonstration* meant, when he applied this Word just as I did, to *Chronology*; for his Note on *Gen. xi. 1.* concludes thus, *as the most learned Primate Usher has demonstrated in his Annals*. Whenever the Proof is as strong, as the nature of the Subject treated on will allow, it is called a *Demonstration*; and the Etymology of the Word as well as the the Common Use of it justifies this Sense. However the Mistake is represented still greater; for I call the same things *Demonstrations* and *Discoveries*.

was; and this (you say) is an *Absurdity* in me: pray, what was it in *Archimedes*, when having hit upon that famous *Demonstration*, he ran about the Streets and cry'd *Ερηνα*, I have discovered it?

As to the Point in Question, viz. the Learning and Flourishing Condition of *Egypt* in *Moses's* time, you scorn to make it good against me, who (you say) seem to know but little of the Matter, p. 69. I am content, Sir, that you should try your Strength against some more learned Adversary. If I am rightly informed, the late learned Dr. *Woodward* has left MS. a Discourse to shew that the *Egyptians* borrowed all their Learning from the *Hebrews*, and to prove likewise that *Moses* their great Lawgiver had a Divine Mission and Authority. This curious Piece may possibly see the light soon, and then, Sir, you may dress up your Answer against it with all that Strength of Reason, Exactness of Quotation, and Decency of Language, which you appear to be master of. And I the rather advise you to choose him out for an Adversary, because you must (I think) acknowledge Him to have been a Gentleman of great Genius and Learning, and every way qualified for the Examination of these Points. A Character which even Sir *Isaac Newton* is not allowed by You, who p. 70. declare it as your Opinion that for a thorough Knowledge of *Antiquity*, and the whole compass of *Greek and Egyptian Learning* there have been and now are Men as far superior to him, as He within his proper Character is superior to every body else. How low is the great *Newton* placed in your Opinion of him! But

F

how

however ignorant you think he was in the Points, you have vouchsafed him such an Answer as shews that there is a Step in Knowledge still lower than that which you have been pleased to assign him. Some Pages you have vouchsafed to bestow upon what He has said in his large and elaborate Treatise of *Chronology*: But with what Success let any Reader judge, who has ever looked into that judicious Work as well as into your slight Answer to it. Sir *Isaac Newton*, p. 193. attempting to prove that *Osiris*, *Bacchus*, or *Sesostris* was the same Person as *Sesac* or *Shishac*, enumerates about thirteen Particulars in which the Historians agree to ascribe the same things to them: You in citing this Passage drop all the Particulars, except six; and then, the greater Part and the most material of them being concealed from your Reader, you call his Argument *mere Conjecture*, and gravely conclude that *he might as well have said that they were all be the same with Alexander the Great, since the same Actions are also attributed to him*, p. 79. I give as one flagrant Instance of your Partiality in Quoting. Vain Effort, to think of confuting such a Writer by such an unfair and superficial Answer! But whenever you shall be more at leisure, or better inclined, to examine his Arguments candidly and thoroughly, and whenever you shall think fit to treat the Subject fully, I will venture to say that you shall not want one, who will attempt to do Justice to Sir *Isaac*'s Proofs, and (as far as I can) to that side of the Question. And when this Promise I will leave you in Possession of (as you think so) of that Question.

I have only one thing more which I would observe on this Article before I leave it: I said that *there are no grounds from the Scripture Story to conclude that the setting up of the Golden Calf in the Wilderness, was to recal the Worship of the Egyptian Apis*: This you call, in p. 85. a *betraying my Ignorance of Scripture*: But how does this appear! Why do you quote three Texts of Scripture, which most only shew that the *Jews* learned the practice of Idolatry in general from the *Egyptians*; not that they worshipped those very gods which the *Egyptians* did: But all this while you misrepresent me: For by the *Scripture Story* I meant, and could mean, no other than the Story as related in *Exod. 32.* from whence I drew my Arguments to prove that the *Jews* in that Act did intend to worship *Murab*, the God who brought them out of the land of *Egypt*: Not *Apis* or any other of the *Egyptian* Gods, in Opposition to whom and with the Destruction of whom they came out of *Egypt*: From this Scripture Story I then and still assert, that there are no grounds to conclude the Golden Calf to have been set up for the Worship of the *Egyptian Apis*: If any other Texts of Scripture favour your Opinion (tho' I think they do not), yet this Assertion of mine can never *betray my Ignorance in Scripture*. But by the way, Sir, should not those who are so free and frequent in charging others with *Ignorance of Scripture*, be very sure that they themselves are not guilty of the very which they are reproaching others with? And yet, in p. 78. you say that *at Jacob's descent into Egypt the whole Posterity of Abraham*

ham reached only the Number of Seventy Persons. Only Seventy Persons indeed went down with Jacob into Egypt: But were They the whole Posterity of Abraham? Have you forgot the Descendants of Ishmael and Esau? So numerous, that some learned Men have reckoned them to have been seven times more than the Family of Jacob. I could give more Instances of your Negligence in reporting Scriptural Facts: But this perhaps may suffice present, and may shew you the Necessity of considering things better, before you throw out such rash Charges for the future.

The last Historical Fact which I contested with you, was in relation to the Confusion of Languages at Babel: This you thought was to be accounted for without the help of the Miracle recorded by Moses, or of any Divine Interposition.

You were of Opinion that all the Variety of Languages observable in the World may be accounted for by natural Causes, exclusive of any Miracle or extraordinary Interposition of God. To disprove this Assertion, I asked you, Whether any or all of your Natural Causes could produce such a Variety of Languages, as that the things which are of most common use in Life, and which all Men are every Day speaking of, should be expressed in different Countries to be expressed by Words which have not the least Affinity with one another, no, not so much as in one Radical Letter? To the Support of this Question I instanced in Water, Hand, Foot, Head, Mouth, &c. and shewed that they are expressed by quite different Words in different Languages. This you call trifling: Fact, you say, is against me: How

Why by mixing and blending the Sounds of con-
 veying Nations, new Names have been formed
 the most necessary things of Life, as well as
 the most obvious Parts of the Body, e.g. one Part
 Italy anciently called the Mouth *Stoma*; the
 other Part, *Os*; now all call it *Bocca*, &c.
 ay, Sir, who were they in that Part of Italy
 called the Mouth *Stoma*? Were they not
 Greeks? Is this then any disproof of what I
 said, viz. that *Mouth* is *Stoma* in Greek,
 and *Os* in Latin? Those Greeks by being in
 Italy did not cease to be Greeks, nor was their
 language any other than the Greek one, where-
 ever it was spoken. Now you say all call it
Bocca: Why now? Was not *Bucca* an old
 Latin Word, used at the same time that *Os*
 was? You seem to insinuate the contrary,
 as you build your Argument on the contrary;
 if the ancient *Latins* called it *Bucca* as the
 modern *Italians* call it *Bocca*, this will not serve
 as an Instance (tho' you bring it for one)
 NEW NAMES having been formed for the
 most obvious Parts of the Body. The same Re-
 mark might be made upon what you have said
 concerning the different Names for the *Eye*
 and the *Ear*; the Answer to your former In-
 stance will serve for these; tho' the Fallacy
 of them all is so visible, that perhaps I have
 need to ask the Reader's Pardon that I have
 not given any of them a distinct Examination.
 You repeat your Sentiment in favour of
 the Power of Natural Causes only to effect
 a Variety as there is seen in Languages;
 you attempt, p. 92. to explain it farther
 than I must me by saying, *It was the natural and*
necessary Mutability of all human things, that
forced

forced Men by Degrees to change their old Words for the more prevailing Sounds of such People had then got the Superiority or principal Rule the Country.

This being the last Argument in your Defence, we may suppose that you intend it a strong and substantial one, such as shall leave a good Impression on the Readers favour of your Strength of Reasoning. I permit me, Sir, to ask you one Question tho' it should prove a troublesome one to answer, *viz.* Whence those more prevailing Sounds arose, and how those who had got the Superiority and principal Rule came themselves to have Words so different from those of the Country which they conquered? Will you answer this Question clearly, you will be able to see that this Prop of your former Assertion is but a weak one, and that it accounts for the Change of Words in the one by an Argument which leaves the Matter unaccounted for in the other. If this reasoning, I am content to be without it.

By this time, Sir, the Reader (I believe) has fully seen how little Credit your Writings deserve in their Appeals to the Authors whom you cite. But the most important Part of your Defence still remains to be examined, I mean that which more openly and directly attempts to *weaken the Authority of Moses.*

Your Sentiments upon this head lie scattered in several Pages of your Defence; but I will take the trouble to bring them a little nearer together, that the Reader may see them more distinctly under one View,

You plead for (a) *some Liberty of thinking as to the Divinity of the Jewish sacred Books*. You (b) *What it is that we Christians are obliged to believe of the Story of the Serpent tempting Eve*? And contend for our understanding *Moses's Account of Paradise, the Creation of Man, and his Fall as an Allegory only*; upon this supposition, (c) *that the Letter is found in Fact contradictory to Reason and the Notions we have of God*. You say that (d) *the Supposition of a certain Degree of Fiction and Fable or Political Lying may possibly be found necessary to the solving of the Difficulties of the Mosaic Writings, without hurt to their Authority or Advantage to Infidels*. You recommend (e) *moderate and qualified Sentiments concerning the Divine Origin of the Jewish Law and the Divine Inspiration of its Founder Moses*: and speaking of Him you observe that (f) *a Persuasion of being under the particular Guidance of God—will always have more or less Influence on the Mind, as it falls in with a Constitution more or less inclined to Superstition or Enthusiasm (the peculiar Character of the Jewish Nation), which is apt to impute every noble Thought and successful Action to the special Suggestion and Assistance of Heaven*: Which words must be understood to express your own sentiments and not those of *Josephus*; for it is well known that the Aim of many Parts of his Works was to shew, that the Jews were the freest from *Superstition and Enthusiasm* of any Nation under Heaven. And (to

(a) Def. p. 42.

(b) Ib. p. 13.

(c) Ib. p. 15.

(d) Ib. p. 45.

(e) Letter. p. 28.

(f) Def. p. 31.

add no more) when, under the Covert of *Josephus's* Name, you had represented the Miracles of *Moses* as not (a) *real* but *pretended* ones, and had, to obviate all Offence, beg'd the Reader to remember, that you were not declaring your own Sentiments but those of *Josephus*, you forbore to declare that Your Sentiments are different from those which you impute to *Josephus*: which you would hardly have fail'd to do, if they had been different; since you could not apprehend that your silence on this head, this time, would be so far from obviating Offence, that it must necessarily increase it.

This is the Figure which you make in your Letter and Defence of it: An attentive Reader sees what your Scheme is, tho' the several Parts of it lie disjointed and dispersed through many Pages.—*Invenias etiam disjecti membra*

There are two Points then which it may be of use to examine: The one, *Whether Moses's Account of the Creation and Fall of Man is to be understood literally or not*: The other, *Whether the Religion and Laws, which Moses delivered to the Jews, had a Divine Origin and Authority*.

I. That *Moses's Account of the Creation and Fall of Man* is not to be understood Literally, you would persuade us by asserting That there is *much Mystery in it*, and that therefore all the Parts of it cannot be Literally true; That the Letter of it is in Fact found contradictory to Reason and the Notions we have of God; and lastly, That the Primitive Writers

(a) Def. p. 32, 33.

general not only followed the *Allegorical Way* of interpreting it, but looked upon this way to be on many occasions the only Method of vindicating it.

Let us see what Truth there is in these three Assertions.

That there is *certainly much Mystery* in the Story you assure us; but where is it to be found? When we go to interpret the Words of that Sentence, which God pronounced concerning the *Enmity between the Serpent and the Woman*, I confess that we ascribe a mystical Meaning to them; and we have good Warrant for so doing: But still the Story it self in all the Parts of it lies open and plain; still it is Literally true, that such a Sentence was pronounced by God. By a wonderful Facility you have of confounding one Word with another, you use *Mystery, Allegory, Figure, and Metaphor*, as all of them meaning the same thing. Hence you say, p. 14. that God MADE MAN, is accepted Literally; but AFTER HIS OWN IMAGE, in a *Figurative or Metaphorical Sense*: Does Metaphor used in Writing by Cicero or any other Author make what he says less Literally true? You will not affirm it surely. Again, you say that the Serpent (Literally understood before), when it accosts Eve, becomes an *Allegorical Beast*. What Misapplication is here of the Word *Allegory*? Did the Serpent cease to be truly and properly a Beast, because it was influenced and actuated at that time by some other Being, as the New Testament warrants us to say? With what Propriety then could you compare the Story, p. 14. to the very Serpent it treats of, as all over spotted and speckled here with Letter, and there with Mystery? The Prettiness of the Thought seems to have made you overlook the want of Justness in it: For (to use your own Similitude) it may be

- more truly said, that as the *Serpent* was a real and proper *Serpent*, tho' animated at that time by an invisible Spirit; so the Story is Literal true, tho' with regard to its Interpretation it includes a *Mystery* in the *Letter*.

In the next place you intimate that the *Letter* of this Story is in Fact contradictory to Reason and the Notions we have of God, p. 15. In your Letter to Dr. W. you had talk'd to the same purpose p. 18, 19. and the Instances which you there give, are no others than what have been often objected to and as often justified and cleared sufficiently. The last Authors which have entered into this Subject, are the learned and ingenious Compilers of the *Universal History*, now publishing; who have in p. 60. given such an Answer to the Cavils that you have raised up again, as may satisfy any candid Enquirer into so difficult a Matter. To that History therefore I refer you, which with great Clearness of Expression and Argument too supports the *Letter* against the supposed Allegory of *Moses's* Account, and shews how the several Circumstances of it may be reconciled to Reason and our Notions of God. I shall only say thus much on the Occasion; that, if it can be shewn consistent with Reason and our Notions of God, (as it certainly may), that God should punish Men at all for their Sins, all the Objections which you have started against the Literal Story of the Fall of Man and the Punishment ensuing, are easily answered; it being evidently as just in God to punish immediately, as at a distance of Time to punish Man by cursing the Earth for his sin, as to inflict the Punishment upon his Person, &c. But I forbear to go further on this Subject, you express your Cavils more fully and explicitly.

Your last Allegation against the Truth of the Literal Story is; that you have not only the Authority of the Primitive Fathers and best Writers, for recurring to the Allegorical Exposition, p. 15. but that they esteem'd this to be on many Occasions the only Method of vindicating the Mosaic Account, p. 17.

This is boldly pronounced; we shall see by and by what Truth there is in it.

In the mean while, Sir, let me ask, why you produce *Philo*, *Clemens*, and *Eusebius*, as Patrons of the Allegorical Interpretation. No one denies that those Writers run much into that fanciful Method; tho', if I mistake not, none of the Allages which you have produced from them to prove it make good your Assertion: You have mistaken the Sense of every one of them. But supposing the Fact to be True, what will you infer from thence? Will you undertake to shew, that because they interpreted this Part of Scripture Allegorically, they did not believe it to have been Literally true? Will you stoop to be an humble Follower of Mr. *Woolston* in this Argument? If you will, you must be content to take Share of his Shame as well as his Reasoning; and the Answers, which have been given to Him on this head, may equally serve for your Confutation.

But let us examine your Authorities: *Philo* stands at the head of them: and I allow that it is his way to turn every thing almost into Allegory; but he more than once cautions his Readers against departing from the Letter of the Old Testament, (a) for (says he) *all the Ceremonies re-*

(a) Τῆς δὲ τὸ ἱερὸν ἀγιστείας καὶ μυείων ἄλλων ἀμελήσομεν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς περὶ τὸν νόμον τοῖς δι' ὑπονομιῶν δηληρυμένοις. De Migr. p. 402.

lating to the *Worship of the Temple* and a thousand other Precepts would be neglected, if we were confine our selves only to the *Allegorical Signification*: And he assures us that *Moses* did not content himself in his History with (a) saying this likely or probable, but he followed the plain and natural Truth. In this View therefore, the first Passage which, you produced, p. 15. from *Philo*, is to be considered, and then it will serve no purpose to yours: But the second Passage of *Philo* which you give us, p. 16. fully implies the Truth of the literal Story, when it is rightly translated. (b) *These things* (says he) *are not mythologic Fictions such as the Poets and Sophisters delight in, δείγματα τύπων* such (Facts) as shew forth Truth, inviting us to search for the Allegorical Sense, in the way of figurative Interpretation: And whoever follows the most probable Conjecture may properly say that the Serpent spoken of is the Symbol of Pride. In this Passage any one may see that the Word δείγματα as oppos'd to *Mythologic Fictions* certainly imply true and real Facts, related to

(a) Οὐ τὰ ἐκότα καὶ πιθανὰ Μωσῆς ἀπαράζει, ἢ ὅτι θεῖαν ἀκραφονίαν μεταδιδώκει. De Sacrif. Abel. p. 132.

(b) Ἐστὶ ὃ ταῦτα ἐπλάσματα μύθεοις τὸ ποιητικὸν σοφιστικὸν χαίρει ἡρόδοτος, ἀλλὰ δείγματα τύπων ἐπὶ γοείαν καλῶν καὶ τὰς δι' ὑπονοίων ἀποδόσεις ἐπὶ τῶν τις ἐκότι σοχασμῶ φήσει περὶ σκηπτικῶς καὶ εἰρημῶν ὅτι εἶναι σύμβολον. De Opif. Mundi. p. 36. In this Passage signifies an Allegory (as *Valesius* shews the Word to signify Note on Euf. Eccl. Hist. l. 2. c. 17.) for want of knowing you have translated the faulty Latin Version per latent conjecturas, by the Discovery of its latent and hidden Meaning but what *Philo* expresses here by αἱ δι' ὑπονοίων ἀποδόσεις expresses in De Migr. Abrah. p. 402. by τὰ δι' ὑπονοίων μύθεα.

out any mixture of Fable; and as this Word is joined to τύπων, it means that they were *Typical* as well as *True*. Thus St. Paul in 1 Cor. x. 11. speaking of some things, which he certainly believed to have Literally happened to the Jews in the Wilderness, says τύποι σωέβαινον, because those Events were *Typical* and *Figurative* of what was afterwards to befall the Church of Christ. In the very beginning of this Treatise concerning the World, Philo explains this matter sufficiently. He observes (a) that some Lawgivers proposed their Laws *naked and without any Ornament* of Figure or Allegory at all, which he thinks poor and low: While others thought to heighten the Dignity of their Laws by conveying Truths under Fictions and Mythologic Stories. And then he represents Moses as following neither of these Methods; not the first because it was *rude and unphilosophical*; not the latter, because it carried a *Lie and Deceit* along with it. The Consequence of all which is, that Moses's Method was to wrap up Truth in Truth, a Figurative and Allegorical Sense in a true and real Historical Relation. From this Account the Reader will now be better enabled to judge that the Passage under Examination must be understood to allow the Literal Truth of the Story concerning the Serpent, tho' Philo represents it as *the Symbol of Pleasure*. One thing more I would observe on this Passage, which is, that the Word *aptly* or *properly* must by the Rules of Construction be joined with φήσει, and not with εἰρημένον ὄφιν; tho' you have joined it with these,

(a) Τῶν ἄλλων νομοθετῶν οἱ μὲν ἀκαλλώπισα καὶ γυμνά —
 ἀτάλαντο· οἱ δὲ — μυθικοῖς πλάσμασι τὴν ἀλήθειαν
 κρύπταντες. Μωσὴς δὲ ἑκάτερον ὑπερβαίνει, τὸ μὲν ὡς ἀσκεπτόν
 ἀφιλόσοφον, τὸ δὲ ὡς κατεφάσμα καὶ μετὰ γοητείας, &c.
 and

and translated *the Serpent as it is aptly called*, &c. with a View, one may suppose, to represent *Philo* as insinuating that the *Serpent* was not a real one but only might *aptly* be called by that Name.

So that *Philo* himself (as has been shewn) allows the *Literal Truth* of the Story: And *Josephus* in his *Antiquities* must be necessarily understood as doing the same, because he tells it in all its parts as having *Literally* happened? What other *Ancient Jewish Apologists* have you now on your side of the Question?

You next quote *Clemens of Alexandria*, and *Eusebius* to shew that they both believed this Story to contain an Allegory: and so they might without giving up the Truth of the *Literal Account*. Both those *Primitive Writers* are misrepresented by you, as I could easily shew; but since you do not expressly infer (tho' you seem to insinuate it) from what you make them say, that they must have disbelieved the *Literal Story*, (which you will find *Eusebius* plainly asserting in *Monseigneur's nova collectio*, p. 258.) I am content to leave you in possession of those Quotations hastening to others which are of more Importance to be carefully examined.

For you go yet farther in the next Paragraph p. 17. and affirm it to be certain and undeniable that the *Primitive Writers* in general esteemed the *Symbolical or Figurative Interpretation of Scripture* to be on many Occasions the only Way of vindicating it, p. 17. To prove this, you again refer us to *Philo*, and I refer you to what has been just now said for his real Sentiments on this matter. Your next Step is to quote Passages from *Barnabas* Epistle, from *Tertullian* and *Origen*; you represent *Barnabas* as saying, That the Command of God about abstaining from some Animals does not import real Prohibition to eat: *Tertullian*, that nothing

so contemptible as the Mosaic Laws about the Dis-
tinction of *Animal Food*: and Origen, that if we
take those Laws Literally, they are unworthy of God,
some of them contrary to Reason and impossible to be
observed, p. 17, 18. For what Tertullian and Origen
say, you refer us to Cotelierius's Note (Chap. x. Not.
8. Edit. Clerici) upon the Passage of Barnabas.
And it is true, that those Passages are there cited
and represented just as you have given them. But
let me ask, Sir, how a *lover of Truth* came to stop
just at this lucky part of Cotelierius's Note, and
not to acquaint the Reader with what you must
have observed Cotelierius immediately subjoining,
viz. (a) that on the contrary very many Passages might
be collected out of the same Authors which speak in
praise of the same Laws of Moses. Is it Ingenuity
to conceal this, and represent so material a Note
so very Partially?

The Truth is with regard to the Passage of
Barnabas, that Cotelierius and Menard too under-
stood it aright when in their Notes upon the place
they suppose the Expression (however strong) to
have meant no more than that the Spiritual Sense
was principally intended, and not the Literal Sense
only, by the Law which forbid the Jews to eat
Swine's Flesh: Parallel to this of Barnabas are
such Scriptural Expressions as these, *Isai. 1. 12.*
When ye come to appear before me, who hath RE-
QUIRED this at your hands, to tread my Courts?
Jerem. 7. 23. I spake not unto your Fathers, NOR
COMMANDED them, in the day that I brought them
out of Egypt, concerning Burnt-Offerings; But this
commanded I them, saying, obey my voice, &c.

(a) Profectò colligerentur facillè plurima è diverso ab iisdem
Veteribus in laudem legum earundem commodius relata.

As for what *Tertullian* is represented by *Cotelerius* to have said, it is wholly mistaken by that Learned Annotator; in which if you had consulted the original Author, you might have satisfied your self. The Words of *Tertullian* are these (a) *What is so mean as the Law about Retaliations* *What is so contemptible as the Distinction of Foods* *the whole Old Testament is the Subject of Ridicule* *every Heretic; for God has chosen the foolish things of the World to confound the Wise: Marcion's God does nothing like this, &c.* Where it is plain, that *Tertullian* speaks Ironically; that he represents *Marcion's* way of thinking, not his own; and intimates that none but Heretics, none but such a set up for *Wisdom*, thought these things foolish or unworthy of God. That what is here ascribed to *Tertullian*, was directly contrary to his Opinion, appears from what *Cotelerius* has cited from him in the same Note (tho' you thought fit to say nothing of it): for the Father in the (b) same Treatise against *Marcion* says, *When the Law forbids the Jews any kind of Food, and pronounces some of the Animals unclean, which God at the Creation called Good it is meant, that they should learn to exercise Continence, and lay a Restraint upon their Appetites, and that it should be a Guard against Lust and Luxury.* This very Passage *Cotelerius* quotes at large in the Note which you refer to, and introduces it there to obviate that very Charge which you would fasten

(a) Quid tam humile quàm talionis indictio? quid tam contemptibile quàm ciborum exceptio? totum, quod sciam, V. omnino Hæreticus irridet: Stulta enim mundi elegit Deus ut fundat sapientiam. Marcionis Deus nihil tale.

Contra Marcion. l. 5. c.

(b) Si lex aliquid cibis detrahit, & immunda pronunciat malia quæ aliquando benedicta sunt, consilium exercendæ continentia intellige, & frænos impositos gulæ: agnosce similes comitibus gulæ, libidini & luxuriæ, prospectum, Ib. l. 2. c.

on *Tertullian*. But what is a Warning to a Man,
 who will take none?

Your second-hand Quotation from *Origen* ef-
 fectually carries its own Disproof along with it:
 when he speaks of things *impossible to be ob-*
erved, is it not plain that he could not be speak-
 ing of the *Mosaic* Laws concerning the *Distinction*
Animal Food, tho' you apply his Words to
 these? Whatever he might think of the Rea-
 sonableness of those Laws, he could not possibly
 think that there was any the least *Impossibility* of
 observing a thing, which in Fact (he knew) was
 always observed. But as the learned Bishop *Small-*
combe, in his *Vindication of our Saviour's Miracles*
 against Mr. *Woolston*, has shewn at large what
 was meant by such Expressions as these, I refer
 for farther Satisfaction on this Point to what
 he has said Vol. I. p. 101, &c.

These are Passages which you call *certain and*
invariable Authorities for the Necessity of vindi-
 cating the Laws about the Distinction of Ani-
 mal Food by figurative Interpretation only;
 every one of them you have evidently mistaken
 the Meaning of the Authors. How much better
 would you have done, if you had taken a Hint from the
 subject which you was upon, and had made a
 distinction of Quotations too, not mixing (as
 you have done) the *Clean* with the *Unclean*, such
 as are grossly misrepresented with such as honest-
 ly speak to your purpose!

We have now seen that the Story of the Crea-
 tion and Fall of Man, does not cease to be Li-
 terally true, tho' it should have Allegory and
 Mystery contained in some Expressions of it;
 that it has nothing *contradictory to our Reason and*
Notions we have of God; and That none of
 the best Jewish Writers and Primitive Fathers, quo-
 ted by you, do reject the Letter of it, much less

H

speak

Speak of the figurative Interpretation as the only Method of vindicating Scripture, in such Instances you apply it to : Let us consider then what positive Proof there is for the Credibility of plain, unfigurative Story. The Nature of Account as it stands in Moses's History, and Testimony given to it in the Books of the New Testament, are both strong Arguments for Truth of the Literal Sense.

If there ever was a History that had the appearance of a plain, open and naked Account is that in the Book of *Genesis*: Every other of it undoubtedly contains a Literal Relation. Why then should we desert the Letter here in direct Inconsistence with all the other parts of that History? And to what purpose (we may ask) did an Allegorical Story, a Truth wrap'd up in Fiction serve, which would not equally have been served by a fair and obvious Literal Relation? Was it not likely that This would be as well received, as long remembred, and much better understood than the Other? Was it not natural for the Relator to suspect that such Fiction, if visible, would tend to lessen all his Credit in other parts of his History? With you it would have lessened it, I perceive, who as soon as you have declared the Story of the Fall to be an Allegory only, think it Probable that it was drawn from Nothing which Moses imbibed in his Youth in the Schools of the Egyptians. A mere School-boy's Lesson, are to suppose!

The other direct Proof of the Truth of the Literal Story is to be drawn from the New Testament, written by those, whom (as a Christian) you must believe to be proper Judges in this Matter.

And this Testimony I the rather appeal to, because it will shew the Rashness of what you assert in p. 13. that the Story of the Serpent depends upon the SINGLE Testimony of an Author, who lived above 2000 Years after the Fact. It cannot be expected that in the New Testament every Circumstance relating to the Creation and Fall of Man should be mentioned; because it was not the business of its Authors to prove the Truth of the Literal Story, which no Jew doubted or made a Scruple to believe. But our Saviour and Apostles, as their Argument led them, have expressly recited or plainly alluded to most of them in the following Passages.

St. Paul says in 1 Cor. xv. 47. that *Adam* was formed out of the Earth: and in 1 Tim. ii. 13. that *Adam* was first formed, then *Eve*, and in 1 Cor. 8. that the *Woman* was ἐξ ἀνδρός of the *Man*, i. e. formed out of him; which manifestly supposes the Story of *Eve's* Formation out of *Adam's* Rib, to have been literally true; tho' You with your Interpreters would have it wholly Allegorical. Our blessed Saviour in Matt. xix. when he had cited *Moses's* Words concerning the Divine Institution of Marriage, For this Cause shall a Man leave his Father and Mother, and shall cleave to his Wife; they twain shall be one Flesh; draws this Inference from those Words, Wherefore they are now twain but one Flesh: What therefore God has joined together, let no Man put asunder; building his Argument plainly upon the Letter of what *Moses* had said, and asserting his Words to be the Words of God. Again in John viii. 44. he says of the Devil was a Murderer from the beginning, he abode not in the Truth, and St. Paul says, 2 Cor. 11. 3. that the Serpent beguiled *Eve* thro' his Subtilty: Both in plain Allusion (I think) to the Literal Account which *Moses* gives us that a Lye

was told when the Serpent said *ye shall not surely die*, by which he caused the Ruin of our first Parents, and was a *Murderer from the beginning*; and these two Passages prove at the same time that the Serpent which thus spoke to them was animated and actuated by the Devil. Nay the very Circumstance of *Eve's* being deceived by the Serpent, afterwards having persuaded her Husband to eat of the Fruit, is literally understood by St. Paul *1 Tim. ii. 14.* where he says that *Adam was deceived, but the Woman being deceived was in Transgression*, i. e. tho' both of them transgressed yet it was the Woman only which was beguiled into the Transgression by the Serpent.

I lay the greater Stress upon these Passages in the New Testament, because in almost all of them an Argument is drawn, for the Proof of something in Question, from the literal Story which would never have been done, if Christ and his Apostles had not fully believed it, which it would have been absurd to have done, if they had understood (as you do) *Adam, Eve and the Serpent* to mean in an Allegory, or the (a) *Mind of Man, the outward Senses and the Pleasure*.

Upon the whole then of this Question I think Sir, that as reasonable Men we may, and that Christians we must allow the *Literal Story of Creation and Fall of Man* to be a true one.

II. I come now to the other important Question which your Cavils have made it necessary to examine, *Whether the Religion and Laws of Moses have a Divine Origin or not.*

You plead, p. 45. for the Supposition of a Degree of Fiction as necessary to the solving the

(a) Letter. p. 21.

scarcities of the Mosaic Writings; and this immediately after you have quoted Eusebius as asserting that in the Books of Moses there are infinite Examples of this kind of Fictions contrived for the Benefit of the Multitude. Thus by pleading for the Allowance of some Degree of Fiction, and including infinite Examples under that Degree, and at the same time not caring to let us know what part in your Opinion is free from Fiction; you give me, Sir, and all that I have talk'd with on the Subject too much Reason for suspecting that your Sentiments on this head are such as you cannot decently own: You declare indeed, p. 45. that the Divine Origin of the Law and Inspiration of Moses is not to be resolved into Fiction and Political Lying: But with this Declaration there are many Passages of your Defence that cannot possibly be reconciled: I shall therefore look upon it as necessary on this occasion to vindicate, against what you have said, the Truth of the Inspiration of Moses and the Divine Origin of his Law.

But before I begin this, it is proper to take notice of the Quotations which you have brought to countenance *Political Lying*, and to shew that *Moses* himself practised it.

Plato and Plutarch are two of your Authorities in favour of *Political Lying*: the Passages produced from both of them are misrepresented, as I could easily shew: but it is scarcely worth while; for they are Heathen Authorities, and you are welcome to them: I could more than double the Number of such Advocates for such a Cause. But are we Christians to form our Sentiments from the Heathen Moralists, when one end of Christianity was to rectify and improve their Morality?

The Authorities, which you produce from the Christian Writers, deserve indeed a distinct Consideration:

sideration: For you have discovered *Clemens of Alexandria* and *Eusebius* as saying that *Plato's* Notion of the Use and Necessity of Publick Fables of Lyes was suggested by what he had observed in the Practice and Example of *Moses*. Let us see how you make this out.

You cite, p. 45. *Clemens* as speaking of the Art of Governing, and saying, that the Ends of Government are to be served by persuading, or forcing, or injuring—or doing what is just, or lying, or telling the Truth as different Circumstances require: Examples of all which and how to use each of them properly, the Greeks to their great Advantage have borrowed from *Moses*. Thus you have represented the Sense of *Clemens* in this Passage; very differently from the true Sense of the Author, as I shall fully shew. There are many just Objections to be made to the several Parts of your Translation; but I shall wave them, and argue only upon the general Meaning and Intent of the Passage. *Clemens* had been particularizing *Moses's* Character as a *Lawgiver*, a *Prophet*, a *Philosopher*, and a *General*: in this Place he comes to consider him as a *General*, and therefore what he here says is not about the *Art of Governing*, but the Art and Skill of a *General*, a thing of another Nature than Political Conduct. He represents (a) the Skill of a *General* as consisting in *Caution*, *Boldness*, and something that is a *Mixture* of both: next, he instances in the several Means of serving

(a) Ἰδέαις ἐπέχει τὸ στρατηγικὸν τείσιν, ἀσφαλῆ, ἀρκεῖν λω καὶ πρὸς ἐκ τέτων μικρῶ — ταῦτα δὲ ὑπάρξει πάντα ἐπιτελεῖν ἢ πείθοντας — ἢ ἀδουμένους — ἢ καὶ τέτων ἅμα τισὶν χρωμένους καὶ τὸ αὐτὸν χερόν· ταῦτα δὲ σύμπαντα καὶ τὸ πᾶς δὲ χρῆσις τέτων ἐκάσῳ ἀπὸ Μωυσέως λαβόντες Ἕλληνας ὠφέλιμα. Strom. I. p. 417.

these three Ends; among which he reckons *Lying* as one: and then he concludes with saying that *Examples of all these the Greeks to their great Advantage have borrowed from Moses*. By the Words *all these*, *Clemens* seems to have intended *Caution*, *Boldness*, &c. But if they refer to the several Means enumerated, of which *Lying* is one; yet it is plain that *Clemens* is not speaking here of what is practised towards Subjects, but towards Enemies or neighbouring States: and it is still plainer that he is not speaking of the *Art of Governing* a People by Laws but of the *Art of War*, of the Office, Skill, and Conduct of a General. This is confirmed by the Words of *Clemens*, which immediately follow your Quotation: (a) *For illustrating this Matter* (says he) *I will produce one or two Examples of his Skill as a General*: and when he sets forth the Instance of *Moses's March* out of *Egypt*; he represents him as making a shew of taking the the nearest way to *Palæstine*; but, when he had advanced a little that way, wheeling off to the Right on a sudden, and leading his People directly to the *Red Sea*. From this Instance it appears, that *Clemens* by *Lying* means (b) *lying in War*, or what we commonly call *Stratagems*, false Marches, false Lights, Spies, &c. and all the other Arts of deceiving an Enemy. And yet this Passage you have produced to shew, that *Plato borrowed from Moses his Notion of the*

(a) Τύπε δ' ἕνεκεν ἑνὸς ἢ καὶ δυτέρου ἐπιμνησθήσομαι ἡρώδου καὶ στρατηγικῆς.

(a) Hence the Military Terms ἡδδοπύρα and ἡδδενέδρα: and thus, when the Trojans were discovered to have Grecian armour on, Virgil says

—primi clypeos mentitaque tela

Agnoscent Danai.

Æn. l. 2. v. 422.

U⁶

*Use and Necessity of Publick Fables or Lyes, to ke
the People more religiously attach'd to an exact O
servance of the Laws.*

With *Eusebius* you have acted still more unfairly. You represent him, p. 45. as saying that in *Books of Moses* there are infinite Examples of the kind of *Fictions* contrived for the Benefit of the *M
titude*. But why do you quote this Author so imperfectly, as to leave out the very Words which explain his Meaning? The *Examples* which brings from Scripture in Proof of what he said, are such Expressions (a) as represent *C* to be *Jealous, Angry*, and to exert other *bas
Passions*. And is there the least Resemblance tween the true Sense of *Eusebius*, and that wh you quote him for?

Thus much concerning your spurious Authorities for *Political Lying*, and for the Practice of as supposed to be borrowed from *Moses*, where the Reader will observe that you have taken care to express any Abhorrence or even Dislike such Publick Frauds, tho' you have taken much pains not only to find out but to make authorities for countenancing them.

Let us come now to the Case of *Josepbus* the Passage out of his Discourse against *A* Book 11. Chap. 16. which I once called *Master-piece of Quotation*, and shall now prove be your *Master-piece of Reasoning* too.

The Passage lies before the Reader in my copy and in your Defence too: where you

(a) Μυρία δ' ἂν εὐρήσεις τοιαῦτα καὶ ἐν Ἑβραίων γεγραπ
ἂν περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ζήλῳ, ἢ ὑπνῳ, ἢ ὀργιζομένοις, ἢ
ἄλλοις ἀνθρωποπαθείσιν ἐνεχομένοις, ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ τῆς δεινῆς
τοιούτου τρόπου παραλημένα. *Euseb. Præp. Evang.* l. 12.

ended your Translation of those Places, in which
 shew'd that you had stumbled and fallen into
 mistakes; and now what is it that you do? Why,
 still hold fast the *Inference*. which you for-
 merly drew from this Passage, and resolve to
 maintain against me or any Man else, that *Josephus*
 does not insist upon any Supernatural or Divine
 Authority of *Moses*, but puts him upon the same foot
 with *Minos* and other Lawgivers of Greece, and
 gives him the Preference only on the Comparison for
 superior Excellency of his Laws; (a) and you
 collected from his *Antiquities*, that his real Sen-
 timents of the Divine Inspiration of *Moses* are very
 different from what they are in this Passage
 of *Apion*. (b)

The contrary of all this I think my self able
 to prove clearly; and hope to convince any un-
 prejudiced Reader, if I shew, what the View of
Josephus was in writing his *Antiquities of the Jews*;
 his Discourse against *Apion*, particularly that part
 in Dispute; if I shew further, That your Inter-
 pretation of it contains several visible Difficulties and
 Inconsistencies; That, notwithstanding all you have said
 to explain'd to the contrary, *Josephus* does there
 clearly shew that he believed *Moses's* Divine Au-
 thority; and lastly, That very many Passages may be
 produced from those and other Works of his, which
 bear and express Terms declare for *Moses's* In-
 spiration and the Divine Origin of the Jewish Law.
 I begin with the first: It is plain that nei-
 ther his Books of the *Antiquities* nor those against
Apion were written with any view to make Con-
 trasts to *Judaism*; but only to give the Greeks,
 chiefly the Romans, a favourable Opinion of
 the Jewish Nation. Consider the Condition in

which *Josephus* then stood; a Pensioner of the Roman Court, a Jew at the Mercy of Heathens, enjoying his Maintenance, his Liberty, and even his Life wholly by their Favour; his Country ruined, his Country-men every where scattered and distressed, and odious above all other People in the Universe. In such Circumstances like a Lover of his Nation and Religion, he set himself to writing that he might vindicate the Antiquity of his Nation, the Excellency of its Form of Government, and the Purity of its Worship and Religion. And at such a time, under such Disadvantages, would it have been thought prudent in him, would it have been Safe for him to have insisted strongly on the Reality of *Moses's* Miracles, and the Divine Authority of the Jewish Religion? Would it have been Wisdom to have press'd those things so far as to expect that his Readers should and must acknowledge the Truth of them? such an Attempt would have been no less than an open Disparagement of the Roman Religion, and of their Laws too, which were borrowed from the Grecian Lawgivers.

For this reason it was that in many Parts of his *Antiquities*, when he had related a Miracle particularly that of the Passage of the Israelites thro' the Red Sea), he leaves his Readers, who were Heathens, to think of it as they please without exacting from them any full Belief of the Story. *Herodotus* does the same frequently and uses the same way of expressing himself. *Josephus* does, even upon Points, where he declares his own Opinion and Belief. *Plutarch* likewise in the Life of *Numa*, when he had expressed his full Belief of *Numa's* real Inspiration, and acquainted his Readers that there was another Story which represented it as a thing pretended only, says πλατεια κηλδος, the way is broad,

(a) Contra
(b) ib. c.

every one think of this Matter as he plea-
Josephus in his Books against *Apion* had the
 same Views as in his *Antiquities*; but besides them
 he had the Objections of the Adversaries of the
Jews to answer and refute: Such as deny'd the
 antiquity of his Nation he replies to in the first
 Book against *Apion*; and in the second after hav-
 ing examined some other unjust Clamours, which
 that vain Author had rais'd against the *Jews*, he
 proceeds to confute the Calumnies of *Apollo-*
phorus Molo, who had represented *Moses* as a De-
 ceiver and Impostor, and his Laws as making Men
 worse instead of better. What should *Josephus* have
 done in Answer to this heavy Charge? Should he
 have drawn out a long List of *Moses's* Miracles,
 and have urged these against Objectors, who were
 not only Heathens but prejudiced Persons? No,
 he takes a Method more likely to succeed: he
 knew that he was going to tread on very dange-
 rous ground, and that the Comparison which he
 was obliged to make between the *Jewish* Laws
 and those Laws which his Readers were gover-
 ned by, was at best an Invidious thing; and there-
 fore by a prudent and dextrous Preface he en-
 deavours to prepare the way for his Vindication
 of *Moses* and the *Jewish* Laws: Twice at least he
 apologizes for the Comparison which he makes;
 (a) he lays it upon Necessity, Self-defence, and
 the Importunity of the *Jewish* Adversaries. And
 when he might hope that the Reader was thus
 softened and won to the favourable side, he be-
 gins with observing two things; (c) The one, that
 such Nations as had lived the longest under Laws

(a) *Contra Apion.* l. 2. c. 14.
 (b) *Ib.* l. 2. c. 14.
 (c) *Ib.* c. 15.

and good Discipline were the most civilized; the other, that all Nations were fond of representing their Form of Government to be very Ancient. He then shews that *Moses* was more Ancient than any of the *Grecian* Lawgivers, and from thence proceeds to compare the *Jewish* Laws with those of the Heathen Nations. In his Account of *Moses* he wholly omits the mention of his Miracles, which, for the Reasons before assign'd, it would not have been prudent for him to have insisted on. But he asserts the Divine Authority of *Moses*, and argues for it first from the Greatness and Disinterestedness of his Actions, and then from the Advantage which his Laws had on the Comparison with those of *Minos* and the other Lawgivers. From both which he himself drew this Conclusion, and intended to insinuate it into his Readers, that *Moses* was no Deceiver or Impostor, but one who reasonably believ'd that he had God for his Guide and Counsellor. This is the plain Sense and Substance of the Place now under Examination.

Let us next see what Difficulties and Absurdities you are forced upon in your way of understanding the Passage; which (according to you p. 26.) puts *Moses* upon the very same foot with *Minos* and the other Lawgivers, and gives him the Preference, only on the Comparison for the superior Excellency of his Laws.

Josephus says of *Moses*, that he thought it necessary above all things to instill into the People a Notion of his doing all things agreeable to the Will of God: Upon this you tell us, p. 32. That *Josephus* could not here intend to persuade us, that this was done by the help of real Miracles, but by pretending Miracles where there really were none, and by deceiving the People by a Shew of something like them, in an Opinion that they were actually done. According to this Explanation of the Words, what

extra

Extraordinary Defence does *Josephus* make of *Moses*? How likely was it to take off the Objections of an Adversary, whose very Cry against *Moses* was, that he was a *Deceiver and Impostor*? Nay your Comment makes *Josephus* own it, even while he is denying it; for from these Words, which you explain as implying Deceit in *Moses*, he presently after draws this Inference, that *Moses* was a *Deceiver, no Impostor*.

In p. 33. you explain *Josephus's* Words not an *Impostor*, to mean one who did not deceive them for Gain and Advantage, but who having formed the best body of Laws, had the best Pretence to deceive the People with the Notion of his being assisted by *God*, p. 36. So that according to your way of explaining *Josephus's* Mind, *Moses* was not a *Deceiver*, tho' a *Deceiver*, because he was a *Deceiver* for their Good. This new Notion of Deceit *Josephus* would have heartily abhorred; and perhaps the Person, who should have imputed it to Him, he would have handled like another *Impostor*.

Again you say, p. 34. that hardly a Greek of those times believed their Lawgivers to be really inspired; that they admired was, that they had the Address to persuade the People that those Laws were dictated by the Gods: So that among the People there was hardly a Man of Sense, it seems: this will never be believed, tho' we have your Word for it; unless you will undertake to prove that by Believing they forfeited their Character of Sense: and after that may'nt one ask where the great Address of these Lawgivers was, who could persuade the People but Fools to receive their Laws as Divine? In the Number of Difficulties, to which your Explanation of *Josephus's* Words reduces you, I reckon your translating Θεοκρατίαν ἀνέδειξε, by he made his Government a Theocracy, p. 37. whereas it plainly signifies

signifies here what the old *Latin* Interpreter rendered it *declaravit*, *he declared it to be*, *he proposed and delivered it as a Theocracy*. You ask whether it is in the power of any *Mortal* to make a *Theocracy*? No certainly, unless by *Divine Warrant*. But when the Words are rendered as above, they are very far from *clinch*ing the whole, as you express it. They shew nothing of any authoritative *Act* or *Deed* in *Moses*, but that of a Deputy only; not that he *made*, but only *promulged* the Law which he gave to the People; signifying to the People that God himself intended to preside over the Government. The Word ἀπέφηνε is exactly of the same import with ἀπέδειξε, and *Josephus* says a little lower, that *Moses* ἀπέφηνε Θεὸν ἀγέννητον *declared God to have been from all Eternity*: would not be absurd here to translate it, as if *Moses* made *God Eternal*?

But enough of these: I could enlarge the Number considerably, but thus much may serve as Specimen for the Reader's perusal, while I hasten to the next Point which was to shew that in this very Passage *Josephus* ascribes a *Divine Authority* to *Moses's* Laws, and puts him upon a different foot from *Minos* and the other *Grecian* Lawgivers, in other respects besides that of the Comparison of their Laws. Let us first consider the Words, *he reasonably believed that he had God for his Guide* and σύμβουλον *Counsellor*. I ask you, Sir, whether the Word σύμβουλος here does not imply an actual Communication of the Will of God? whether any good *Greek* Author the mere acting agreeable to the presum'd Will of any Man, be enough to denominate that Man a σύμβουλος in that Matter συμβουλεύειν, when spoken of Equals, signifies *to give Advice*; when of Superiors (as here), to *communicate their Mind or Will*, and consequently to be the Authors of that in which they are σύμβουλος.

Thus, I think, all Writers use the Word; but I am sure, that *Josephus* uses it so twice within a few Lines of this very Passage. He says of *Moses*, that he was an excellent σύμβουλος Counsellor, and a most wise σύμβουλος Counsellor to the People: where he must certainly mean, that he communicated his Mind to the People; not meerly that the People acted agreeably to what they thought he intended they should do. From this Observation it may be inferr'd, that the Phrase κατὰ τὴν Θεοῦ βουλὴν, which follows in the next Sentence, should be render'd, not (as you render it) agreeably to the Will of God, but by the Will of God, by his Direction, by a Signification of his Will to *Moses*. So you render'd it your self in your Letter, tho' in your Defence you have thought fit to change it for the other Translation, which does not so strongly imply *Moses's* acting here by the Divine Will and Direction.

A second Proof is this: *Josephus*, when he speaks of *Moses*, says expressly, that *Moses* acted reasonably in believing that he had God for his Guide and σύμβουλον Counsellor, and that he was persuaded in his acting and directing all things by the Will of God: but when the same *Josephus* speaks of *Minos* and others as attributing the Origin of their Laws to *Apollo* and *Jupiter*, he affirms nothing expressly against it; but leaves their Authority to stand upon the two current Reports, i. e. of either their really believing so themselves, or fancying by so doing means to make the People submit to them the more easily. Is this putting *Moses* upon the same footing with *Minos* and the others? Is there not plainly a Doubt intimated in the one Case, and is there any shadow of a Doubt so much as hinted in the other? The thing speaks for it self: and that *Josephus* can mean by what he says of *Minos*, &c. is to guard against giving any offence

sence to his Heathen Readers, who had received those Laws as given from Heaven.

In farther proof of this Point, I insisted in my first Reply (and still do) upon the word *αἰχῆσαι* intended by Josephus to mean a *boasting without foundation for it*, and to insinuate covertly that the Inspiration of *Minos* and the other Lawgivers was only a *pretended* one. This I assert to be the common and usual, the first and proper Sense of the Word: But you (a) call this *distinction* child and ridiculous, and say that from the use of Language and common Sense *αἰχῆσαι*, when apply'd (here) to Men famous in their Generations, can have no other Sense than to be proud of or celebrate with Praise. Strange, that you could thus mistake the Construction here is not *αἰχῆσαι Μίνω*, but *αἰχῆσαι Μίνω γεγόνενα*: where this Verb is join'd with another of the Infinitive Mood, and the Word *αἰχῆσαι* in such Construction must signify *boast of a thing without ground for it*. The first Example of the Sense of *αἰχῆσαι* in *Steph. Lect.* con shews that *Thucydides* uses the Word so; *when they have beaten some of us, they boast (pretend) that they have routed us all: but according to your way of construing, it is, they are proud of us all, they celebrate us all with praise*. That *αἰχῆσαι* in this passage was intended by Josephus to imply a *pretence* only, appears from using the Word to signify so (c) elsewhere; more plainly from comparing what is said afterwards of *Minos* and the other Lawgivers with what was said before of *Moses*. Of *Moses* he peremptorily declar'd that he had God for

(a) Def. p. 34.

(b) Κατ' ἑστέρας τινὰς ἡμεῖς, πάλιν αἰχῆσιν ἀπεῖπα.

(c) Περὶ τῆς Ἀρκάδων, τὸ δὲ λέγειν αἰχῆσαι ἀρχαῖα ταῖς &c. Contr. Apion. l. 1. c. 4.

receiv
d in m
ἀρχῶν
with
tly th
awgivi
o be t
Sense
n child
of L
ly'd
can be
ate w
mistak
, but
is join
and t
gnify
The v
ph. Le
so;
boast
t acco
they
th pra
by J
from
ere;
aid aft
ers w
es he
l for

Counseller; of *Minos* and the others he makes a Doubt, whether they had a divine immediate Assistance, or only pretended to it; so that *Josephus*, consistently with himself, could not make the Comparison between what *Moses* and They were; but only between what He *was*, and They *assumed* or *pretended* to be.

These three Proofs then, drawn from the Passage in Dispute between us, are sufficient to overthrow your Assertion, That *Josephus* does not here ascribe a *Divine Authority* to *Moses*, but puts him on the same foot with *Minos* and the other Law-givers.

I now come to the last Point, which will abundantly strengthen the preceding Proofs, and shew that *Josephus* in this Discourse against *Apion* and in his other Works has fully, explicitly and frequently declar'd his Belief of *Moses's Inspiration* and the *Divine Origin* of his Law.

In the first Book against *Apion*, he says, that (a) the Prophets, the only Writers of the Sacred Books, when they wrote of the ancient times learn'd their Account by Divine Inspiration: that (b) the *XXII. Books*, which make up the Jewish Canon, were justly believ'd to be Divine ones; five of which were written by *Moses*; and that (c) God gave Testimony to the Virtue and Excellency of *Moses*.

In his *Antiquities*, *Josephus* expresses himself still clearer on the Article of *Moses's Inspiration* and the *Divine Authority* of the Law: mentioning the

(a) Μόνων τῶν Προφητῶν τὰ μὲν ἀνωτάτω καὶ ἀρχαιότατα κα-
τὰ ἐπίπνοιαν ἔχειν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ μαρτυρήσθαι. c. 7.

(b) Δύο δὲ μόνον περὶ ἀποστολῶν βιβλία. τὰ πάντως χεῖρας ἔχοντα
ἀνθρώπων, τὰ δὲ δικαίως Θεῶν πεπιστώμενα καὶ τέτων πέντε μὲν
τὰ Μωυσέως. c. 8.

(c) Τῷ δὲ ἀρετῆς πάλας ὁ Θεὸς μαρτύριον εὕρηται γένησθαι.

Commandments which *Moses* receiv'd from God he says, that (a) *the Hand-writing of them was from God's*. When he describes what happen'd at the giving of the Law from Mount *Sinai*, he says (b) that the *Thunders and Lightnings shew'd that God was present*: and he says, (c) that *all the Jews heard the Voice (of God) from Heaven, pronouncing all the Commandments, which Moses left with them in the two Tables of Stone*. When he represents *Moses* as about to deliver his Laws to the People, he makes him say that (d) *they were such as God had dictated to him*; and that *Josephus* himself thought the same of them with what *Moses* says, appears both from what he adds soon after, that *Moses* published his Laws to the People (e) as *he had received each of them from God*: and from speaking (f) elsewhere in the same Words, saying that *God dictated to Moses the Laws which he enacted*. To support this farther as the same Sentiment of *Josephus*, it is remarkable that he speaks, in another place, of some who (g) *had no good-will to the Jews, and yet confessed, that it was God who had established their Government by the means of Moses*.

In his Discourse upon the *Machabees*, he commends *Eleazar* and the seven Brethren for suffer-

(a) Ἡ χεὶρ ἦν ἐπὶ τῇ γραφῇ τῶ Θεοῦ. Antiq. l. 3. c. 5. Sect. 1.

(b) Ἐδείκνυντο καὶ κεραυνὸν τῶ Θεοῦ. l. 3. c. 5. Sect. 2.

(c) Πάντες ἤκουον φωνῆς ὑψόθεν παραγγελλούσης εἰς ἅπαντας ὥστε διαφγεῖν μηδὲνα τῶ λόγων, ὡς Μωϋσῆς, &c. ib. Sect. 4.

(d) Συνέθηκε ὑμῖν καὶ νόμος, ὡς ἀγορεύσαντός μοι Θεοῦ πολιτείας. Antiq. l. 4. c. 8. Sect. 2.

(e) Ὡς ἕκαστον τι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ πύθοιτο.

(f) Ταῦτα μύθοι καὶ τὸ ὑπαγορεύειν τῶ Θεῷ συνετάθη. l. 3. c. 8. Sect. 8.

(g) Ὡς καὶ τὸν μισθῆναι ἡμᾶς ὁμολογεῖν, ὅτι τὸ πολιτεῖν ἡμῖν ὁ κατασκευάσας ὅτι Θεὸς διὰ Μωϋσέως.

the most cruel Death rather than depart from the *Laws of God*; and breaking out into a pathetic Admiration of *Eleazar's* Constancy, he calls him a *Lover of the Divine Word*: and indeed his whole Discourse upon the *Machabees* has neither Force nor Sense in it, if *Josephus* had not really believed the Jewish Laws, for which they suffer'd, to be of Divine Authority.

These Passages (a few out of many) may suffice to shew the Rashness of your Assertion, or the Negligence of your reading, who profess, p. 40. to have collected even from *Josephus's* Books of *Antiquities*, that his real Sentiments of the divine Inspiration of *Moses* was very little different from what is represented above, i. e. that they were against the Reality of such Inspiration, and ascribed it all to pretence only; for this is all which you, it seems, are able to gather from the above-mentioned Passage in the Book against *Apion*.

I must not here omit a Quotation, which you have made, pag. 40. from those Books of *Jewish Antiquities*; and which you seem to look upon as a clear proof, that *Josephus* could not have believed one at least of the *Miracles*, recorded by *Moses*, to have been really and strictly effected by God, in the very manner, that the literal Text imports. It is in what follows the Story, which *Josephus* tells, of the miraculous Passage of the *Israelites* thro' the *Red Sea* according to the Scripture Account of it; after which he adds, *Let no Man be surpriz'd at the strangeness of this, that an ancient and innocent People should find a Way opened for their Escape thro' the Sea, either by the Will of*

(a) ὅτι πὲρ τῶν Θεῶν νόμων ἕως θανάτου πόνων καταρροήσαντες.
ἀ. 1.

(b) Φιλόσοφοι θεῖον λόγον. Sect. 7.

God, or κατ' αὐτόματον of its own accord; since in like Case as it were of Yesterday the Pamphilian Sea retir'd before Alexander, and opened him a Passage (a) when God had determined to put an end to the Persian Empire. From whence you infer, p. 4. that Josephus could not believe the absolute Inspiration of the Sacred Writings, because (as you think) he left it in doubt, whether this Fact had any thing miraculous in it or not: but nothing in this Passage, rightly considered, satisfies me that he speaks of this matter as a doubtful Point with Himself. In the preceeding Section, he says, that the Jews (b) had God visibly assisting them: this is directly asserting the Miracles: and whatever Josephus meant by αὐτόματον, yet thus much is certain that he looked upon God as directing and interposing in both Cases, in the Passage of the Israelites thro' the Red Sea, and of Alexander thro' the Pamphilian Sea; for of this last, he says, God having determined, &c. So that what happened to Alexander was (according to Josephus) in consequence of that Divine Resolution; and this plainly enough supposes an especial Providence of God in Alexander's Case. Some are of Opinion, that the Words εἴτε καὶ ἢ βέλῃσιν Θεῷ, εἴτε κατ' αὐτόματον, may be understood, not as opposing a Miracle to a Natural Cause; but as implying only some difference in the manner of the Divine Interposition: But if not, they must be allow'd to mean, not that Josephus doubted about the Miracle, but that he would not insist upon it (tho' he firmly believ'd it) to those of his Readers who were ready enough to dispute it, and perhaps ridicule it. For if Josephus had himself doubted of the Miracle, he need not have call'd upon his Readers

(a) Καταλῦσαι ἢ Περσῶν ἡγεμονίαν τῷ Θεῷ θελήσαντι.

(b) Τὸν Θεὸν ὥτως ἐναργῶς ἐχούσας βοηθούσα.

since in
 ilian S
 Passag
 nd to
 r, p. 4
 Inspira
 i think
 any thin
 this Pa
 e speak
 nself. I
 he Jew
 direct
 Joseph
 certain
 d inter
 ne Isra
 thro' th
 God ha
 ened t
 n conf
 is plain
 of Go
 on, the
 at' aw
 g a M
 ng on
 vine In
 ow'd
 the M
 it (th
 lers wh
 haps r
 ed of th
 his Rea

not to be surpriz'd at the Strangeness of it; he
 might better have confessed, that there was no-
 thing strange in it, nothing but what was owing
 to your accidental Concurrence of natural Causes.
 And here it must not be forgotten that you
 pretend to have found *Philo* in the very same way
 of thinking, as you represent *Josephus* to have
 been in; i. e. expressing a Doubt whether *Moses*
 received his Laws from God or not. The Words
 of *Philo* which you produce, pag. 41. are these;
*Whatever he dictated to them, whether he contrived
 and invented it himself, or had received it from the
 Divinity, they imputed it all to God.* This is one Pas-
 sage, from whence you insinuate, that it is rea-
 sonable to allow some Liberty of thinking as to the
 Divinity of the Sacred Books, pag. 42. But *Philo's*
 Words, when rightly considered, give no Colour
 for any such Allowance. They are part of a Frag-
 ment of that Author preserved by *Eusebius*; and
Eusebius tells us, that *Philo* is here defending the
 Jews against their Accusers. *Philo* begins with
 saying, (a) *We will consider Moses, if you please,
 as differing in nothing from other Men: i. e. as not
 having any Divine Assistance.* Having thus set him
 at the lowest, he argues, that he must have been an
 excellent Man, because of the many great and wise
 Things which he did for the Benefit of the Peo-
 ple. Then he speaks of the *Jews*, who submit-
 ted themselves so unanimously to his Conduct for
 such a length of Years, and amidst such pressing
 Difficulties, as they met with in the Wilderness:
 and he infers, that either they must have been a
 regular tractable and civiliz'd People in their Na-
 ture, or they must have been rendered such by the
 Providence of God: and which soever (says he) of

(a) Εἰς ὃ ἐν τῷ πολλῶν, ἐν βέλαι, διαζορ. Euseb. Præp.
 lib. 1. c. 6.

the two Suppositions you will take, it will turn out for the Honour and Credit of the Jews. And the in the Passage under Examination, he concluded with saying, that (a) whatever Moses dictated them, whether he contrived it himself, or received from the Deity to give them, the Jews now impute it all to God, tho' above 2000 Years are passed; they have not alter'd so much as one Word of what he left in Writing, and would die many Deaths rather than act contrary to the Laws and Customs which he established. You see here, that Philo's Point was not to give his Opinion about the Divine Authority of Moses; but to shew the Virtue of his Nation, which so early submitted to Laws and so long adhered to them: and this was equally proved, whether Moses had a Divine Authority, or not; it was proved even upon the Supposition (which Philo made for the sake of Argument only) that Moses differed in nothing from other Men, with respect to any supernatural Assistance. Let this Passage therefore, thus grossly misrepresented, be no more brought in favour of allowing Christians a Liberty of thinking, &c. but let them rather remember that Philo's Sentiments about Moses's Inspiration may be clearly seen when he says, that Moses (b) was taught many the most abstruse Parts of natural Knowledge by the Answers of God; that (c) he wrote the Sacred Books from the Dictates of God; that he spake by a Divine Spirit; and that his Laws were truly and really Divine ones.

(a) Εἴτε ἐν λελογισμένῳ αὐτῷ, εἴτε ἀκέρων παρὰ θεοῦ ἐρεασε, τὸτο ἅπαν εἰς τὸ θεὸν ἀνάγειν καὶ πλεονάζειν διεληλυτότων ——— μηδὲ ῥῆμα γε αὐτὸς μόνον τὸ ὑπὸ γεγραμμένων κινήσαι, &c. *ibid.*

(b) Χρησμοῖς τὰ πολλὰ καὶ σωεκλικώτατα τὸ φύσεως διδαχθεῖς. De Opif. Mundi. p. 2.

(c) De vit. Mosi, l. 2. p. 655, 656, 664.

But enough of this: we have seen from *Josephus's* profess'd Design in composing his several Works, that his Business was not to insist too much upon the Miracles of *Moses*; That in the Passage (which I have been examining) your Interpretation of it carries great Difficulties, and even Absurdities along with it: That the Passage itself, well considered, speaks in favour of the Divine Authority of the *Mosaic Law*; and that many other Passages in *Josephus's* Books against *Apion* and in his *Jewish Antiquities* are express and clear to the same Purpose.

There remains nothing therefore, to shew that we ought not to entertain moderate and qualified Sentiments about the Divine Origin of the *Jewish Law*, and the Inspiration of its Founder *Moses*, except the Testimony of *Christ* and his *Apostles*, who expressly assert it, as I am going to shew. And this Testimony of *Theirs* must be allow'd as sufficient Proof by you, who in pag. 4. declare yourself a true Friend to Christianity; and therefore I shall conclude these Sheets with shewing that those Sentiments, which you sometimes propose in *Josephus's*, but which by pleading for openly and earnestly, and even by approving and recommending to your Readers you make your own, are directly contrary to what we are taught in the Books of the New Testament, which as a Christian you must believe to be Sacred and Divine.

The Writers of the New Testament do very often appeal to the Books of *Moses* as containing not only Types but (a) Prophecies of our Saviour, and represent our Saviour himself as insisting up-

(a) Luke xxiv. 27, 44. John i. 45. Acts iii. 22. xxvi. 22. and
 xiii. 23.

on the same kind of Proof to shew that he
(a) the Prophet foretold by *Moses*; the plain Con-
sequence of which is that *Moses* was inspir'd.

Our Saviour builds (b) an Argument for
Resurrection of the Dead upon the Literal Tr
of God's really appearing to *Moses* in the burn
Bush and saying, *I am the God of Abraham*, &
which Words he calls God's Words, and wh
if they had not been, his Argument would h
been unconvulsive. The miraculous Passage
the *Israelites* thro' the *Red Sea* is acknowledged
the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* (c) w
says that *by Faith they passed thro' the Red Sea*
by dry Land; where the Miracle is necessarily i
ply'd in that Passage and is ascribed to *Fa*
The same Writer says, that God (d) *spake to*
Moses and to the *Jews* from the top of *Sinai*, and t
his Voice shook the Earth. We are told that
Moses was admonished by God, when he was about
make the *Tabernacle*, to make all things according
the *Pattern* shew'd him in the *Mount*. It is
that the *Jewish* (f) *Law* was ordained by *Ang*
in the hand of a *Mediator* (*Moses*), and that it
the (g) *Word* spoken by *Angels*. Our Saviour c
one of those *Ten Commandments*, which *Moses*
first delivered to the *Jews*, the *Commandment*
God, (h) and the *Word of God*. And the *Laws*
Moses, by which the *Judges* were to determ
Causes, he calls (i) the *Word of God*. St. P
citing one of the *Laws*, viz. (k) *Thou shalt*
muzzle the Mouth of the Ox that treadeth out

(a) *John* v. 46, 47.

(b) *Matth.* xxii. 31, 32.

(c) *Hebr.* xi. 30.

(d) *Hebr.* xii. 16, 25, 26.

(e) *Hebr.* viii. 5.

(f) *Gal.* iii. 19.

(g) *Heb.* ii. 2.

(h) *Mark* vii. 9, 13.

(i) *John* x. 35.

(k) *1 Cor.* ix. 9.

at he plainly Con-
d.
nt for
eral Tr
e burn
abam, S
nd wh
ould h
Passage
wledged
s (c) w
ed Sea
ffarily
to Fa
ake to
i, and t
that
as about
ccording
It is
by An
hat it
viour c
a Moses
andmen
e Laws
determ
St. P
u shalt
th out

Corn, plainly affirms the *Divine Origin* of it in what he adds, *Does God take care for Oxen?* and the whole Law of *Moses*, his Code or Body of Laws, is frequently stiled (a) *the Law of the Lord*, and bears the Title of (b) *the Oracles of God*.

You profess, p. 72. to think it a Point fundamental and necessary to be believed by all Christians, that while a Man is under the actual Influence and Direction of the Holy Ghost, he must at the same time be infallible and superior to all Error, or else Christianity cannot be defended. This you say with respect to what St. Stephen taught in *Act. vii.* when full of the Holy Ghost; and that this is a fundamental Point, I readily agree (with Exception only as to the mention of such Facts, as are not recorded in Scripture, and have no relation in the least to that Doctrine, for the teaching of which St. Stephen was filled with the Holy Ghost): However as you allow no Exception to be made, and hold St. Stephen to have been then superior to all Error, give me leave to offer his Testimony upon the Point in Question, as what must satisfy You and does entirely satisfy Me, because it relates to Points which have a Connexion with Christianity.

St. Stephen then full of the Holy Ghost, declares that (c) the Angel of God appeared to Moses in the Bush, that God sent him to be a Ruler and Deliverer of the Israelites, that Moses (d) shewed Wonders and Signs in the Land of Egypt and in the Red Sea: Here the Truth and Reality of Moses's Divine Authority is asserted, and the miraculous Passage thro' the Red Sea is attested, by one whom you acknowledge superior to all Error. And the same infallible Speaker assures us ver. 38. that

(a) Luke ii. 23, 24, 39. (b) Rom. iii. 2.

(c) *Acts* vii. 35. (d) *Ib.* 36.

Moses received from the Angel, that spake unto the lively Oracles, which he gave unto the Jews, so that you have his Testimony for the Divine Origin of the Jewish Law. Nay, that the Tabernacle itself was erected by an immediate Order of God, and by a Pattern given from Heaven, we have clear Authority of the same St. Stephen, who Acts ver. 44. that the Tabernacle of Witness in the Wilderness was, as God had appointed, speaking of Moses, that he should make it according to the Fashion that he had seen (i. e. which was shew'd him on the Mount): With such a Testimony as this, you will not easily reconcile what in your Discourse of sporting you say, p. 38. that I may believe if I please, that Moses with all his Wisdom was not able to direct the building a Chapel or making a Candlestick and Snuffers, but by Divine Inspiration and after a Model given by God.

Upon a review of what I have said in favour of these two Points, *The literal Truth of the Jewish Story about the Creation and Fall of Man; the Divine Origin of the Jewish Law with the Inspiration of its Founder Moses;* I am in some hopes that what has been offered may be satisfactory to your self, and to the Readers, if of them had entertained qualify'd Sentiments about those important Points. If I have in any part of my Argument imputed Sentiments to you, which you really have not, I am very ready to do Justice, whenever you shall make it appear that what you have said (not only in *Josephus's* Narrative but in your own) did not necessarily lead me to believe that they ought to be imputed to you. However you have it in your Power to vindicate your self by a full and strong, an open and explicit Account of your Thoughts on these Matters. If I know my self, I am far from being prepossessed with senseless Systems, and darken'd with Prejudice.

will any (I believe) that know me, rank me
 your List of *rash and dogmatical Divines*, espe-
 cially of *thorough-pac'd* ones, in the opprobrious
 title which you seem to intend by that Expression.
 (whatever Appellations I run the Hazard of)
 cannot subscribe to a Belief, which you seem to
 me, that such Points as these are the *weak Out-*
works of Christianity, which ought to be *demolished*,
serving only for Shelter and Lodgment to the En-
emy, whence to batter it more effectually, p. 3. Weak
 strong, they have a necessary Connexion with
 Christianity, and cannot possibly be *demolished*,
 they may basely be quitted; but if they are
 given up to the *Enemy*, will they less
 for his *Shelter and Lodgment*? Will he not,
 in possession of them, *more effectually batter*
 Christianity from such *Works* as are so closely join'd
 its *firm and natural Entrenchments*? If we are
 judge by what is seen in War, we must de-
 termine quite otherwise than you do: For a skilful
 Commander always takes care to defend his *Out-*
 works while he can; and it is generally concluded,
 when they are given up or lost, the Body of
 the Town is not likely to hold out long. But,
 all, Sir, where is the Justness of your Simi-
 litude, since the Defence of Christianity can ne-
 ver be compared with the Defence of a Town?
 can give up nothing that we think a part of
 Religion: It is not left to our Prudence or
 Policy, to our Skill or our Strength to make new
 works, or *demolish* old ones: Whatever the
 Word of God has taught us is a part of the Body
 of the Town, which we are trusted with the De-
 fence of, not by *Political Lying*, not by the False-
 hoods of Quotation, but by Appeals to the Ho-
 ly Scriptures of God, and by the honest Applica-
 tion of those Aids, which we borrow from hu-
 man Learning. If you had thus defended the
 side

side which you took in this Dispute, I should have look'd upon our Controversy as a mere difference in Judgment, as a free and serious Inquiry on both sides: But when at every Step I found and still find you misquoting the Words and misrepresenting the Sense of Authors, it is not in my power (I confess) to think you a fair and impartial Writer. Should you therefore once more appear in publick upon this Subject, let me advise you to examine your Authorities more carefully, and to offer nothing which cannot honestly be defended. This will be Justice to Truth and the Publick: It will be Credit and Reputation to your self, for whose natural Abilities I have some Esteem, and should have more, were it not abated by a View of your Application of them. In this Advice I shew how much I am,

S I R,

Jan. 21. 1731-2.

Your sincere Well-Wisher, &c.

F I N I S.

